

INDUSTRIAL INCENTIVES STUDY

This year's Act also authorizes the Secretary of the Interior to make a full and complete investigation and study of methods to provide incentives for the construction of facilities and works by industry to reduce or abate water pollution, including possible use of tax incentives. This will be a very important study.

I think from my brief discussion of this year's Act that everyone can see the magnitude of it.

OTHER FEDERAL ACTS PROVIDING WATER POLLUTION CONTROL ASSISTANCE

In addition to P.L. 660, as amended, there are also other Federal financial assistance programs in this area. Federal grants for the construction of water pollution control, water supply, and related facilities can be obtained under the Housing and Urban Development Act, the Public Works and Economic Development Act, the Demonstration Cities Act, the Consolidated Farmers Home Administration Act, and, although not applicable to Florida, the Appalachian Regional Development Act. Loans are also available under the public facilities loan program.

EXEMPTION FROM INVESTMENT TAX CREDIT SUSPENSION

The recognition by Congress of the need for industry to control its pollution was reflected this year in the suspension of the 7 percent investment credit under the Federal tax code. The legislation, as enacted, specifically exempts from this suspension those capital expenditures for facilities, installations, machinery, and equipment which contribute to the elimination, control, or prevention of air and water pollution.

RECENT FEDERAL LEGISLATION ON ADEQUATE WATER SUPPLIES

The increasing awareness of the "water famine" has recently been reflected in the enactment of the Northeast Water Supply Act, the enactment of the Water Resources Planning Act, the creation of a Water Resources Council, the maintenance of full appropriations for the small watershed development program, the provision for Federal grants and loans for basic water supply facilities, and in several other important actions.

THE EXTENT OF THE FEDERAL EFFORT

I have directed my remarks up to this point to the Federal effort to control or abate water pollution and to maintain sufficient water supplies, but I am not trying to make you think that the Federal Government has done, is doing, and will do everything that needs to be done throughout the Nation in this field. That is not and should not be the role of the Federal

Government in this program. The Federal Government's efforts have been enormous, but, in my opinion, we are probably very close to the maximum extent of the Federal effort.

There are several philosophies on the Federal role in controlling water pollution and in insuring adequate water supplies. There are those who say the Federal Government should do everything, and there are those who say it should do nothing. There are those, like myself, who say that the Federal Government does have a responsibility in these areas, but I also say the programs will be a success only if all levels of government assume their proper responsibilities.

In my opinion, the Federal Government is largely meeting its responsibilities in the construction of sewage treatment works and pollution abatement enforcement. You have seen in the Water Quality Act and in the Clean Waters Restoration Act several distinct trends which, I am sure, are obvious to you. They are trends toward greater State participation; toward full cooperation among all levels of government; toward bringing the largest single source of pollution—industry—into the picture through incentives; and toward greater reliance on the States to enforce water quality standards.

The recent increase in the Federal effort is not a sign that the Congress is permitting the Federal Government to take over responsibility for the entire program. Rather the intent runs, in my opinion, in the opposite direction. As one of the drafters and principal supporters of workable Federal water pollution control legislation, I say to you that the non-Federal interests must now assume their rightful responsibilities and fully implement effective programs.

THE NEEDED FLORIDA EFFORT IN THE FUTURE

My purpose here today is not only to tell you what the Federal Government has done but also to leave with you some thoughts on what the future role of the State of Florida should be in these programs, if Florida is to meet its responsibilities.

Toward such an end, I offer the following proposals for your consideration in the course of this week's conference:

1. I propose the creation by the next session of the Legislature of a Florida State Natural Resources Commission, headed by a person with Cabinet rank and with full responsibility for air and water pollution control and natural resources development programs. It is time to elevate these programs from the bureaucratic jungles of Florida boards to their proper level in responsible State government.

2. I propose State and Federal tax incentives for any industrial facilities, installations, machinery, or equipment, which con-

tribute to pollution treatment and provide for the elimination, control, or prevention of air and water pollution, provided those units meet certain standards established by the appropriate Federal and State agencies.

3. I propose the appropriation by the Legislature of adequate funds to permit the State to meet its responsibilities under Federal law and to take maximum advantage of the Federal grant program to abate water and air pollution and also to permit the State to take such other action as may be needed to attack air and water pollution, including the training of additional State technical personnel, provided such trainees agree to remain in the State's employment for at least a minimum specified period of time.

4. I propose the requirement by State statute that all county, metropolitan area, or regional planning agencies must provide for minimal air and water pollution control and abatement requirements.

5. I propose that all developers of industrial parks and housing developments of specified size to be constructed in the future by required to construct adequate waste treatment works to treat the discharge from such industrial facilities and residences.

There are, of course, other proposals which could be made, but I consider the ones which I have just enumerated to be the most important, although their relative importance is not necessarily in the order in which I presented them. Unfortunately, I cannot be with you for the duration of your conference, but your consideration of these and other proposals should be a worthwhile effort. Although the realization of my proposals will require a substantial expenditure by the State, I am confident that the benefits which would accrue to the State, if these proposals are carried out, would more than offset the expenditures. Furthermore, I think these programs should have a higher priority than some of the items we now find in the Florida budget.

IN CONCLUSION

The Federal Government has done much to control and abate water pollution and to provide measures to insure against inadequate water supplies, but the responsibility lies now, more than ever before, on the State and local governments, public and private organizations, industries, and concerned citizens.

It will be groups like the Florida Pollution Control Association and the American Water Works Association and citizens like yourselves on whom will rest the ultimate success of this effort. Like any governmental program, the realization of the goals envisaged in the enactment of statutes and ordinances to rectify our critical water problems ultimately rests with the people in a free society.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

MONDAY, JANUARY 16, 1967

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

The Reverend (Father) Walter J. V. Schmitz, Sulpician priest, and dean of the School of Theology of the Catholic University of America, Washington, D.C., offered the following prayer:

Let us pray: Lord, Jesus Christ, who said to Your apostles: *In whatever home you enter, greet it saying, "Peace be in this house";* may this same peace abide here. Be pleased, O God, to shield and to free from any harm all those here dedicated to serving their country. Fill these legislators, these chosen leaders of our country, these representatives of our

good people with the spirit of wisdom, prudence, and strength, and instill in them a holy fear, so that they may faithfully use their talents for Your glory and for the benefit of their fellow men.

Our legislators, Lord God, rely on You as their source of knowledge and understanding, and so we earnestly beg You to put Your blessing on their every effort and project, so that mankind will deepen their convictions of charity and good will toward their fellow men and ultimately be nearer to their God who is the way, the truth, and the life. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

The Journal of the proceedings of Thursday, January 12, 1967, was read and approved.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate by Mr. Arrington, one of its clerks, announced that the Vice President, pursuant to title 20, United States Code, sections 42 and 43, appointed Mr. SCOTT as a member of the Board of Regents of the Smithsonian Institution.

The message also announced that the Vice President, pursuant to Public Law 89-491, appointed Mr. PASTORE, Mr. BYRD of Virginia, Mr. COTTON, and Mr. BROOKE as members of the American Revolution Bicentennial Commission.

RESIGNATION OF ASSISTANT DISBURSING CLERK

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following communication from the

assistant disbursing clerk, minority, U.S. House of Representatives:

DECEMBER 6, 1966.

HON. JOHN W. MCCORMACK,
The Speaker,
U.S. House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

MY DEAR MR. SPEAKER: I feel that the time has come for me to retire from active employment, and it is therefore requested that you accept my resignation as assistant disbursing clerk (minority), United States House of Representatives, as of December 30, 1966.

You may be assured that my nearly twenty years service as an employee of the House has been a most pleasant and gratifying experience.

With all good wishes.

Sincerely yours,

FREDERICK M. KISSINGER.

COMMUNICATION FROM THE CLERK OF THE HOUSE

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following communication from the Clerk of the House of Representatives:

OFFICE OF THE CLERK,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, D.C., January 14, 1967.

The Honorable the SPEAKER,
House of Representatives.

SIR: From the United States District Court for the District of Columbia, the Clerk of the House of Representatives has received a subpoena duces tecum, directed to him as such officer, to appear before said court as a witness in the case of U.S. v. Robert G. Baker, and to bring with him certain and sundry papers therein described in the files of the House of Representatives.

The rules and practice of the House of Representatives indicates that no official of the House may, either voluntarily or in obedience to a subpoena duces tecum, produce such papers without the consent of the House being first obtained. It is further indicated that he may not supply copies of certain of the documents and papers requested without such consent.

The subpoena in question is herewith attached, and the matter is presented for such action as the House in its wisdom may see fit to take.

Sincerely yours,

W. PAT JENNINGS,
Clerk, U.S. House of Representatives.

(Note: Report to room No. 3825, 3d floor, United States District Court Building, Third and Constitution Avenue, NW., Washington, D.C.)

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE
DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

Spa ad Test—Court of Chief Judge Curran.
United States of America v. Robert G. Baker, Criminal Case No. 39-66.

The President of the United States to the Honorable W. Pat Jennings, Clerk, House of Representatives, Washington, D.C.

And bring with you: All records of any nature relating to reports filed by the Democratic Senatorial Campaign Committee for the years 1962 and 1963 pursuant to the Federal Corrupt Practices Act.

You are hereby commanded to attend the said Court on Friday, January 13, 1967, at 9:00 O'Clock A.M., to testify on behalf of the United States, and not depart the Court without leave of the Court or the United States Attorney.

WILLIAM O. BITTMAN,

MARVIN R. LOEWY,

Attorneys for the United States.

Sterling 3-5700, ext. 7073.

Witness, the Honorable Edward M. Cur-

ran, Chief Judge of said Court, this 13th day of January AD., 1967.

By MARJORIE W. VANDIVIER,

Deputy Clerk.

ROBERT M. STEARNS,

Clerk.

Marshal's Return

Summoned the above-named witnesses-----

U.S. Marshal,

District of Columbia.

By -----
Deputy U.S. Marshal.

RESOLUTION RELATING TO PRO- DUCTION OF CERTAIN DOCU- MENTS BY THE CLERK OF THE HOUSE

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I offer a resolution (H. Res. 127) and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 127

Whereas in the case of United States against Robert G. Baker, (Criminal Case No. 39-66), pending in the United States District Court for the District of Columbia, a subpoena duces tecum was issued by the said court and addressed to W. Pat Jennings, Clerk of the House of Representatives, directing him to appear as a witness before said court at 9 antemeridian on the 13th day of January 1967, and to bring with him certain and sundry papers in the possession and under the control of the House of Representatives: Therefore be it

Resolved, That by the privileges of this House no evidence of a documentary character under the control and in the possession of the House of Representatives can, by the mandate of process of the ordinary courts of justice, be taken from such control or possession but by its permission; be it further

Resolved, That when it appears by the order of the court or of the judge thereof, or of any legal officer charged with the administration of the orders of such court or judge, that documentary evidence in the possession and under the control of the House is needful for use in any court of justice, or before any judge or such legal officer, for the promotion of justice, this House will take such action thereon as will promote the ends of justice consistently with the privileges and rights of this House; be it further

Resolved, That W. Pat Jennings, Clerk of the House, be authorized to appear at the place and before the court named in the subpoena duces tecum before mentioned, but shall not take with him any papers or documents on file in his office or under his control or in possession of the House of Representatives; be it further

Resolved, That when said court determines upon the materiality and the relevancy of the papers and documents called for in the subpoena duces tecum, then the said court, through any of its officers or agents, have full permission to attend with all proper parties to the proceeding, and then always at any place under the orders and control of this House, and take copies of any documents or papers; and the Clerk is authorized to supply certified copies of such documents and papers in possession or control of said Clerk that the court has found to be material and relevant, except minutes and transcripts of executive sessions and any evidence, of witnesses in respect thereto which the court or other proper officer thereof shall desire, so as, however, the possession of said documents and papers by the said Clerk shall not be dis-

turbed, or the same shall not be removed from their place of file or custody under said Clerk; and be it further

Resolved, That a copy of these resolutions be transmitted to the said court as a respectful answer to the subpoena aforementioned.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

MEMBERSHIP OF STANDING COMMITTEES

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. speaker, I offer a resolution (H. Res. 128) and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H.R. 128

Resolved, That during the Ninetieth Congress the Committee on Agriculture shall be composed of thirty-five members;

The Committee on Appropriations shall be composed of fifty-one members;

The Committee on Armed Service shall be composed of forty members;

The Committee on Banking and Currency shall be composed of thirty-three members;

The Committee on Education and Labor shall be composed of thirty-three members;

The Committee on Foreign Affairs shall be composed of thirty-six members;

The Committee on Government Operations shall be composed of thirty-five members;

The Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs shall be composed of thirty-three members;

The Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce shall be composed of thirty-three members;

The Committee on the Judiciary shall be composed of thirty-five members;

The Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries shall be composed of thirty-three members;

The Committee on Post Office and Civil Service shall be composed of twenty-six members;

The Committee on Public Works shall be composed of thirty-four members;

The Committee on Science and Astronautics shall be composed of thirty-one members.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

ELECTION OF MEMBERS TO STANDING COMMITTEES

Mr. LAIRD. Mr. Speaker, I offer a resolution (H. Res. 129) and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. Res. 129

Resolved, That the following-named Members be, and they are hereby, elected members of the following standing committee of the House of Representatives:

COMMITTEE ON WAYS AND MEANS: John W. Byrnes, Wisconsin; Thomas B. Curtis, Missouri; James B. Utt, California; Jackson E. Betts, Ohio; Herman T. Schneebeli, Pennsylvania; Harold R. Collier, Illinois; Joel T. Broyhill, Virginia; James F. Battin, Montana.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

THE LATE HONORABLE JOHN E. FOGARTY

Mr. KIRWAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks

at this point in the RECORD and include a newspaper article.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

Mr. KIRWAN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to include an article written by Howard A. Rusk, M.D., which appeared in the New York Times of Sunday, January 15.

I believe this to be a most worthy article depicting some of the worthwhile things accomplished for his fellow man in the short, but full life, of the late, beloved, John Fogarty.

The article follows:

MR. PUBLIC HEALTH—DEATH ENDS LONG FIGHT BY REPRESENTATIVE FOGARTY TO GIVE AMERICA FREEDOM FROM DISEASE

(By Howard A. Rusk, M.D.)

If hospitals, research laboratories and institutions for the aged, infirm and retarded had flagpoles, every flag would have flown at half-staff this past week to mourn the loss of John E. Fogarty.

Representative Fogarty of Rhode Island died of a heart attack last Tuesday at the age of 53.

Flags at half-staff would not, however, been limited to institutions. They would also have been in evidence in thousands of homes throughout Rhode Island and the nation.

Mr. Fogarty was not just interested in institutions and dollars. He was interested in people, and no appeal for help that went to his office was ever left unanswered. He would go to inordinate ends to try to find the solution to problems that were all too often insoluble.

No one in the history of this country has done more to promote more and better health services, more and better health facilities and more and better health research than Representative Fogarty.

PLANNED NEW CRUSADE

Ironically, his death came just before he was to be sworn in for his 14th term—a time when he was mobilizing his forces for another all-out crusade against disease, disability and death.

Also ironically, his death was caused by a heart attack, his own personal public enemy number one as the primary killers of others.

The contribution of John Fogarty to improving health and rehabilitation services for the American people are legend.

When he entered Congress our Federal investment in medical research was but \$3-million. It is now well over \$1-billion.

During his freshman year in the House of Representatives, the number of disabled persons rehabilitated into employment under the public program was but 12,000. Last year it was more than 154,000.

Medicare, Medicaid, more nursing home beds, Federal aid for the training of physicians and other health workers, the clinical center of the National Institutes of Health, workshops and classrooms for the mentally retarded and all of the other tremendous advances in health and rehabilitation in the last quarter century stand as monuments to this late "Mr. Public Health."

He and his co-worker in the Senate, Senator Lister Hill from Alabama, were recognized as the great health leaders of all time. They complemented and supplemented each other in their continuing fight for the fifth freedom—freedom from disease.

STARTED AS BRICKLAYER

Mr. Fogarty's formal education ended when he received his high school diploma. He immediately followed in the footsteps of

his father and older brother and became an apprentice bricklayer.

He was only 27 when he was first elected to Congress from Rhode Island. During World War II he served as an enlisted man in the Navy construction corps. After the war he returned to Congress to carry the torch for the enlisted men in the armed forces.

Having been denied a formal education and a college degree, he made possible through his untiring efforts the education of literally thousands of others as physicians, scientists and technicians because he cared.

Some years ago Mr. Fogarty was challenged with the opportunity to run for the Senate from Rhode Island. After a great deal of discussion with his friends and colleagues he decided his destiny was in the House of Representatives where he could continue his fight for health as chairman of the Subcommittee on Appropriations for Labor and Health, Education and Welfare.

This was a decision that for suffering humanity was a blessed one.

John Fogarty, who started as a bricklayer, ended his career by placing countless bricks in a solid foundation of modern laboratories, medical schools, hospitals, institutions for the mentally ill and the retarded, and research laboratories that extend from the halls of science to the community itself.

With his bright green tie and his Irish accent, he was a circuit rider for health, a teacher, a preacher, a fearless foe to any challenger who stood in the way of his crusade.

He died on the field of battle. His friends from the scientist to the sick mourn his loss and call him blessed.

HAIL TO THE PACKERS

Mr. RANDALL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

Mr. RANDALL. Mr. Speaker, hail to the Packers. As one of the Members who represents the Kansas City metropolitan area, it would be a happier thing to be able to say today, "Hail to the Chiefs" as a poetic parallel to that great band music which is played whenever our Chief Executive appears.

Yesterday, the first "Gridiron World Series" was witnessed by 63,000 in the Los Angeles Coliseum and was seen on nationwide TV by 45 million for a sports event record. It was Green Bay most of the way or certainly after the entertaining halftime activities.

In the second half the Packers exhibited such methodical, machine-like play that they kept the Chiefs under constant pressure. Green Bay exhibited fine team play but the difference was Bart Starr's performance. His timing was so perfect it appeared he could have thrown those passes blindfolded.

The first Super Bowl was really two games. For all Kansas Citians, the first half was a dandy ball game and the second half was something else. For this reason some of us from the Kansas City area now believe the length of professional games should be shortened so they play just half as long.

Those who have talked about the superiority of the National Football League will now be able to continue to refer to

the American Football League as the "other league" or the "juniors." The Packers were rather rude to our Chiefs but if we did not compare so well in yesterday's game, remember one game is not a true test of the ability of both leagues. The AFL will catch up after we have the opportunity for common drafts of collegians.

Our Kansas City Chiefs have nothing to be ashamed of. We won the American League title and as matters turned out, it was no disgrace to be beaten by a great team such as the Green Bay Packers. As several of the Chiefs players promised after the game, "We will be back next year." On behalf of all Members of the House who represent American League Football cities, I know I can say, like those who enjoy another great national game, "Just wait until next year."

But on this day following the first Super Bowl game in history, all those who love professional football and every true sportsman can join in the salute, "Hail to the Packers."

All loyal Kansas Citians felt the sting of the loss by our Chiefs but we will be good losers, as we would have been good winners. It is a pleasure to bow with lifted hat to my counterpart, the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. BYRNES], who today enjoys the privilege to bask in the glory of a truly great world champion professional football team from the district he has the privilege to represent.

HAIL TO THE WORLD CHAMPION GREEN BAY PACKERS

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

The SPEAKER. The Chair will recognize our good friend, the gentleman from Wisconsin.

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I rise with a real sense of pride.

Yesterday, the Green Bay Packers became the world professional football champions by defeating the Kansas City Chiefs in Los Angeles, 35 to 10.

I am proud to represent this magnificent football team and the Green Bay community in Congress, and I extend to every Packer, on behalf of the entire Eighth Congressional District of Wisconsin, heartfelt congratulations on their history-making achievement.

The Packers yesterday became the first team to win the world's championship in a playoff between the champions of the American and National Football Leagues. It is fitting that Green Bay should be the first world champions. The team has a long and proud history. They were one of professional football's first teams. They have won 10 previous championships. They have become a synonym for excellence. They have shown by their conduct, on and off the field, in victory and in defeat, that they are true champions in every sense of the word.

I congratulate each member of the team. I congratulate Vince Lombardi, general manager and coach, for a victory which climaxes a truly remarkable coaching career at Green Bay. I congratulate the officers and directors who have provided leadership for this com-

munity-owned team. I congratulate the people of Green Bay, the Eighth District and all of Wisconsin, who have supported the Packers through thick and thin and who, in the final analysis, have made the success of this team possible.

At the same time, I want to pay tribute to the Kansas City Chiefs, a fine football team, who showed, in the way they took their defeat, that they, too, are real champions. Kansas City can be proud of them.

Mr. Speaker, I know every Member of this House joins me in extending congratulations to the world champion Green Bay Packers.

Mr. WAGGONER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin. I yield to the gentleman from Louisiana.

Mr. WAGGONER. It might be a little premature to claim that championship until the Green Bay Packers have played Alabama.

THE FEDERAL-AID HIGHWAY PROGRAM SHOULD PROCEED

Mr. FLYNT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Georgia?

There was no objection.

Mr. FLYNT. Mr. Speaker, today I introduce a House concurrent resolution expressing the sense of Congress that the Federal-aid highway program should proceed as rapidly as available revenues to the highway trust fund permit, and that the integrity of the highway trust fund should be preserved.

I introduce this resolution because in November 1966 the U.S. Bureau of Public Roads announced that Federal funds for highways would be reduced substantially because of increased costs associated with the Vietnam war.

While we all are concerned about inflation resulting in part from increased Government spending necessitated by this war, it is doubtful that the announced cutback in the amount of Federal funds which can be committed for highway construction in fiscal year 1967 will have any great effect on current inflationary trends.

Mr. Speaker, the national interest will continue to be served if the Federal-State highway program is allowed to proceed as planned. Early restoration of the cutback in Federal highway expenditures is essential in view of the ever-mounting number of traffic injuries and fatalities which improved highway facilities can help to reduce.

If this important program is cut back and funds are withheld at this time, it will be more expensive to build the same highway 1 year from now than it is today, because of constantly rising construction costs.

It would seem only just that adherence to a Federal program, paid for by special taxes which are held in trust for one specific purpose, should be given first

consideration in an assessment of national economic policy.

WILDERNESS AREAS AND OUTDOOR RECREATION

Mr. ASPINALL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Colorado?

There was no objection.

Mr. ASPINALL. Mr. Speaker, one of the permanent achievements of the 88th Congress was its adoption of the Wilderness Act. Not only did that act extend protection to a vast acreage of national forest land that had already been classified as wild or wilderness but it also provided for review of other lands in the national forest system, the national park system, and the fish and wildlife refuge system to see which could properly be classified for inclusion in the wilderness system. That review is now going forward in the departments, and we can expect quite a number of bills this year and next as a result of this review. Extension of the wilderness system is a matter in which both our Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs and the Public Land Law Review Commission are taking and will take a great interest.

Two statements have recently been made by Mr. John F. Buchanan, of Del Norte, Colo., which deserve consideration by all persons interested in wilderness legislation. One was presented at a hearing held by the Public Land Law Review Commission in Albuquerque, N. Mex., on November 11 last year. The other was presented at a hearing on the Washakie wilderness proposal in Riverton, Wyo., on December 8. I commend them to my colleagues for the information they convey and the point of view they espouse:

STATEMENT OF JOHN F. BUCHANAN, PUBLIC LAND LAW REVIEW COMMISSION, ALBUQUERQUE, N. MEX., NOVEMBER 11, 1966

Members of the commission, Commission Staff, Advisory Council, Governors' Representatives, Ladies and Gentlemen:

I am John F. Buchanan, a lumberman; I live in Del Norte, Colorado. We of the Rocky Mountain region welcome you to the heartland of the "public domain" West. We thank you for coming to us to listen to our views as to future public land use and administration. We are grateful you have come to this land and its people for the destinies of both, in no small measure, rest with the decisions of this Commission.

Today, I wish to talk about a new and dangerous philosophy in land use, the causes and motivations underlying this philosophy, the disastrous consequences that lie ahead, if it prevails, and the injury it will do to balanced recreational use of our public lands.

What is this new philosophy, a philosophy being ever louder drummed into the ears of an unformed public? It is the philosophy of "de facto wilderness", propagandized by a small but very skillful group of people.

And what is "de facto wilderness"? Bluntly stated, shorn of half-truths, stripped to bare-bone facts, "de facto wilderness" simply means that all public domain lands, other than waterless and treeless desert, now un-

roaded and under-developed in multiple-use management, should, forthwith, be incorporated in the Wilderness Preservation system.

With apparent total disregard for sound, proven conservation practices, heedless of the need for a balanced recreation use of our public lands, unmindful of other multiple uses, these individuals and groups incomprehensibly cry, "more, more, evermore."

Well they know that no responsible user-group or individual is, today, opposed to the incorporation of existing primitive areas into the Wilderness Preservation system. Over the years, to their credit, they have educated a majority of our people to the need of preserving unique areas having true wilderness quality, in a permanent preservation system.

What, then, is the underlying cause in this shift from responsible advocacy of quality wilderness preservation to an irresponsible advocacy of vast increases in the wilderness system, with the sole criteria that of quantity? What is at the root of this apparently insatiable demand for more wilderness, to the point of public assertion that any large area of presently unroaded, forested, federal land is "de facto wilderness?"

What has motivated these groups and individuals to demand, far beyond the acreages in our present primitive areas, these increases to the point that never before in our history have so many been asked to give so much to so few?

The root of the problem lies in what has been happening, over the last twenty to thirty years, in our large cities. No need to document, here, the sociological, physical, moral, and racial changes overwhelming our metropolitan areas. No need to document, here, the abdication of social and civic responsibility by the affluent and the moderately well-off, the so called responsible citizens, who have fled from the cities to the suburbs, taking with them their churches, their schools, and their culture.

In their desertion of civic and social responsibility, they have left behind, today's crisis problems of social frustration, racial tensions, ethnic and racial ghettos, ballooning crime, moral and physical decay. The resulting guilt complex has brought on a psychotic trauma that must have relief in some direction. Unwilling to face peril where peril is, unwilling or unable to cope with rot and blight in their cities, they go far afield to exercise the trauma that engulfs them.

Having permitted blight to overcome their cities, these groups and individuals embrace a cause to stop imagined blight elsewhere. To exorcise their guilt complex, they turn their backs on the tough, hard job of the rejuvenation of their cities, and in self-exoneration rush headlong to the cause of quantity wilderness preservation and loudly cry, "There shall be no blight here—no devastation like unto our cities—no vandals to destroy—no mobs to desecrate—no use but for the enlightened few."

Does it not follow, then, that the greater the guilt complex, the deeper the trauma, the more frustrating the feeling of shame because of the blight of their cities, the more pronounced is the dedication to preserve, in sterile bondage, not only true, quality wilderness, but all forested areas as yet unroaded and not fully developed under dynamic, multiple-use management?

The tragedy is that rushing headlong, with misguided zeal, to freeze vast acreages in static preservation, they are sowing the seeds of destruction that will destroy the very thing they seek to preserve.

These groups and individuals glibly argue that such single-use preservation will maintain the ecological purity of these locked-up areas. Little do they realize that, long ago, civilization's demands and needs irrevocably destroyed nature's ecological balance of our forested lands—be they public or private.

Over the centuries, the true cyclical pattern of our forests has been growth, disease, decay, death, followed by the cleansing purge of natural wildfire with resulting re-birth and new growth. Man has, and rightly so, subverted this natural cycle. We can no longer tolerate unchecked wildfire as a balancing agent.

What, then, must we do to correct the imbalance in the ecological cycle created by our suppression of fire? Man must substitute man's management instead of nature's age-old management to maintain balance in our forest. What are the tools of scientific forest management? They are access, harvest, insect control, fire prevention and suppression, and tree planting—Access, above all, as it is the key to sound, many-use, resource management—Harvest, to remove diseased and decadent trees, to increase water production, to improve game habitat—Insect and fire control, to prevent catastrophic destruction—Tree planting, to hasten the renewal of our forest wealth.

The miners, stockmen, water users, the vast majority of our recreationists, timber harvesters, and public land managers ask only that resource facts prevail over resource folly. A forest, like a city, is an ever-changing, living organism. Lock-up the Western Forests in barren, single-use preservation, neglect them, subject them to non-management, look the other way when they are ravaged by uncontrolled fire, disease and insects, and as surely as God made them, they will suffer the blight and devastation of our cities.

The proof, you ask. What better proof than the White and the Routt Forests, up where I come from, where some twenty years ago, these healthy, flourishing forests were attacked by the spruce bark beetle. Unchecked by management controls, we have, today, in the Flat Tops Primitive Area, some 60,000 acres of whitened sepulchres bearing mute but forceful testimony to the futility of sterile preservation.

Again, look at our Rocky Mountain Lodgepole pine forests where dwarf mistletoe is twice-over destroying more timber than is being harvested.

On all our National Forests, fire, disease, insects, blowdown, animals and other causes are taking an annual toll greater than the annual harvest for all the wood using industries.

In the light of these facts, with loss greater than harvest on our managed public lands, it is not crystal clear this nation simply cannot afford to put additional vast acreages, over and above the presently designated wild, wilderness, and primitive areas, into single-use, non-managed, "de facto" wilderness.

On the contrary, we must place greater emphasis in achieving full resource-utilization on those public lands now designated for multiple-use management. In the field of recreation alone, we are neglecting that great majority of our people who cannot take advantage of wilderness type recreation. Because of cost, family make-up, physical attributes, time, and inclination, most people are restricted to, and prefer, that kind of recreation requiring roads, campgrounds, readily accessible lake and stream side areas.

We must seek compatibility and balance between the multiple-use choices on our public lands. We must avoid those choices that lead to conflict and strife in the use of our public lands. Let us preserve our heritage through true conservation, that of sound, multiple-use, forest management. Let us re-dedicate ourselves to those multiple-use, management practices that will enhance, protect, and perpetuate the one principle, above all others, governing Public Land policy, that of achieving the greatest good, for the greater number, over the long run.

The overwhelming majority of us, the stockman, miner, water user, lumberman, hunter, fisherman, and roadside recreationist, have confidence this Commission—coming to the people, as it has, for our views and opinion—will establish in its ultimate decisions, those objectives, principles, and policies that will assure the well-being of the land and its people.

STATEMENT—WASHAKIE WILDERNESS HEARING, RIVERTON, WYO., DECEMBER 8, 1966, BY JOHN F. BUCHANAN, DEL NORTE, COLO.

Mr. Chairman, Distinguished Guests, Ladies and Gentlemen: My name is John F. Buchanan. I reside in Del Norte, Colorado.

I wish to commend the Forest Service, in its proposal on the Stratified Primitive Area, for giving increased emphasis to the needs of America's largest, but least recognized and most under-privileged, vacationing class making use of our public lands—the family camping and sight-seeing groups.

I direct your attention to three significant areas described in the Washakie Proposal. In Area "A"—South Fork Wood River (an addition)—the recreation potential of the Running Cedar is recognized by establishing the boundary approximately a mile above this area. In Area 2—Lean-To Creek (an exclusion)—634 acres are recognized as "lands predominantly valuable for developed recreation." And finally, in Area 3—Wiggins Park (an exclusion)—the Forest Service again recognizes "lands which are primarily valuable for potential developed recreation."

These areas, relatively unimportant, in themselves, have an importance, beyond that of their size or location. Their importance, I believe, lies in the indication of a trend, both on the part of the Forest Service and the National Park Service, toward a major increase in facilities for the forgotten people in the public land recreation picture—the camping, picnicking, and recreation-travel families.

Today, I want to plead the cause of that vast majority of those American families whose voices are never heard in wilderness hearings, who, though they have the most compelling interest in a vacation opportunity suited to their needs, are unremembered and unrepresented in hearings such as this.

I'm going to make some comparisons between wilderness, wild, and primitive acreages and their visitor-day use, on the one hand, and campground, picnicking, organization-camp use, resort use, and recreation-residence use acreages and their visitor-day use, on the other hand. And I'm going to present other comparisons that should bring home to the thoughtful, responsible, and reasonable people of this country, the realization that there is a great and growing disparity in the public-land vacation opportunity for the majority of our people.

All of the statistics as to acreages and visitor-day use are taken from the latest available Forest Service and National Park Service publications.

First, let's examine the magnitude of today's set-asides by the Forest Service in wilderness, wild, and primitive areas and the National Park set-asides in tentative wilderness designation. The combined total, both agencies, is 21,758,800 acres. To give some perspective to 21,758,800 acres: this is more than the combined total acreage of Connecticut, Delaware, Massachusetts, Maryland, New Jersey, Rhode Island, and Chester County, Pennsylvania. These six states and one county have a population of 18,367,600, which is over 10% of the total population of the United States. Place every man, woman, and child—all 18,367,600 of them—simultaneously on today's reserved wilderness and each of them would be the sole occupant of 1.3 acres.

In 1965, 160,336,100 visitor-days were spent on National Forest lands. Of this total number of visitor-days only 4,522,400, or 2.8%, were visitor-days of wilderness use. Certainly, there is no indication here that we need an expansion in the present wilderness, wild or primitive areas.

By way of contrast, let's see how the other 97% of visitor-days were spent by National Forest visitors in 1965.

	Visitor-days	Percent
Camping.....	40,065,000	25.4
Picnicking.....	9,444,800	6.0
Recreation travel (mechanized).....	29,325,400	18.6
Boating and water sports.....	8,482,300	5.4
Hunting and fishing.....	30,296,300	19.2
Organization, resort, and residence use.....	18,530,300	10.8
Other.....	19,669,600	11.8
Total.....	155,813,700	97.2

These visitors—over 97%—did not want or could not use a wilderness type of vacation.

What, then, do they need? The greatest need is campground facilities—40,065,000 nights were spent by 40,065,000 people in campgrounds. 30,296,300 days were spent hunting and fishing; this use, also, requires camping facilities. The balance, boating, water sports, picnicking, organization, resort, and residence use, all require developed recreation areas. All of these uses are family vacation uses and all can be participated in and enjoyed on the multiple use portion of the Forests. All of these uses need road access, developed areas for safety, sanitation, and people convenience.

What facilities are offered by the Forest Service for this vast majority of public-land vacation-users? They offer 7,228 developed campsites occupying 41,015 acres. Visualize these comparative figures: For the 4,617,461 visitor-days of wilderness use, which is only 2.8% of the total use, the Forest Service provides 14,617,461 acres, or 7.8% of the total National Forest Area. Compare this wilderness vacation opportunity with the vacation opportunity of the campground user. For the 40,065,000 visitor-days of campground use, which is 25.4% of the total use, the Forest Service provides only 41,015 acres, or .022% of the total National Forest area.

Let me repeat. Wilderness use 2.8%—Campground use 25.4%; Wilderness acres 14,617,461—Campground acres 41,065 acres; Wilderness 7.8% of total acres—Campground .022% of total acres. For each acre of visitor-day campground use the wilderness user has 3,545 acres for each visitor-day use, over three thousand to one available recreation opportunity in terms of acres.

In terms of people, we have ten times as many people who want and use a campsite as the people that want and use wilderness areas. By 1972, the Forest Service estimates it will need facilities for 80,000,000 visitor-days use of campgrounds.

In spite of this tremendous inequality in acreage, people-use, and future demand, no responsible land user groups (with minor exceptions) are advocating reduction in the present acreage of wilderness, wild, or primitive areas. No one here today, I venture to say, will call for elimination or substantial reduction of the Stratified Primitive Area.

Not so with those, who in spite of the self-evident, gross imbalance in vacation opportunity, continue to press for ever-increasing acreages devoted to single-use in sterile, wilderness preservation.

Let's look at the record. "The Wilderness Society" report, dated October 24, 1966, Page 2, lists the following tabulation entitled "Nine Hearings Completed, 40 to Go by Mid-1967."

Area	Agency's recommendation	Wilderness Society's recommendation
San Rafael Wilderness Area...	110,403	154,000
Great Smoky Mountains National Park	247,000	350,000
San Gabriel Wilderness Area...	36,137	36,137
Spanish Peaks Wilderness Area...	54,894	78,000
Mount Baldy Wilderness Area...	6,975	8,500
Craters of the Moon National Monument	40,800	40,800
Lassen Volcanic National Park	49,800	101,000
Flat Tops Wilderness Area...	153,245	250,000
High Uintas Wilderness Area...	322,998	374,000

The Agency's recommendations, which in most cases, were for greater acreages than are now in the reserved area, totaled 1,022,252 acres. The Wilderness Society's recommendations totaled 1,392,437 acres—a 37% increase over the Agency's recommendations.

With seemingly total disregard for the vacation opportunity of 97% of those who vacation on the National Forests, this willful minority of less than 3%—the wilderness advocates—are relentlessly pushing the implementation of a "de facto" wilderness policy.

If you have any remaining doubts as to the policy and plans of this minority of less than 3%, let me quote from an address delivered in Seattle in April, 1966, by Mr. Stewart M. Brandborg, Executive Director of the Wilderness Society, entitled "The Future of the Wilderness Act." He says, and I quote: "Our job now is to see that this nine-million-acre National Wilderness Preservation System grows to its proper size—perhaps 50 million acres by 1974."

Fifty million acres is approximately two and one-half times more than the twenty-one million acres now classified as wilderness, wild and primitive areas by the Forest Service and National Park Service.

This small minority of less than 3% continue to build straw men to mask their bold and thoughtless pursuit of "de facto" wilderness preservation. They continue to create "bogey men" where none exist. They state they "must fend off attacks by the lumber industry," "must fend off schemes of dam builders."

They attack where no force opposes them. Where has a responsible voice been raised these last few years against preservation of existing wilderness under the Preservation Act?

Let them take heed, however, that there is an increasing awareness, by the overwhelming majority, of those public-land vacationists, who desire and need developed recreation areas, that "de facto" expansion of wilderness will, in the end, short-change them out of their rightful place in the recreation picture.

The wave of the future lies not in the increase of public lands devoted to single-use preservation, but rather it lies in the preservation of existing single-use areas, with a many-fold intensification of multiple-use on non-reserved public lands, including accelerated development of multiple-purpose vacation areas.

AFRICA, CONTINENT OF CHANGE, AND AMERICAN INTEREST

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD and include two addresses by Assistant Secretary of State Palmer.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

CXIII—29—Part 1

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, as chairman of the Subcommittee on Africa of the Committee on Foreign Affairs, I am extending my remarks to include the full text of two recent addresses by the Honorable Joseph Palmer II, Assistant Secretary of State for African Affairs, with the strong recommendation of their careful and thoughtful reading by my colleagues.

Africa, with its large domain, its great natural wealth, and the spirit of restless drive that characterizes its people, is certain to occupy a position of ever-increasing importance. It is no exaggeration to say that the nations of Africa will contribute in no insignificant measure to the building of the world of tomorrow. It is my hope and prayer that the United States and the new nations of Africa will continue to work together in understanding for the goals that are ahead and have mutual attraction.

Assistant Secretary Palmer has had more than 20 years of experience in African affairs. From 1960 to 1964 Mr. Palmer was U.S. Ambassador to Nigeria.

Born on June 16, 1914, in Detroit, Mich., where his family lived for a brief interval, Mr. Palmer went to school in Boston, Mass., area. He attended Harvard University where he received a bachelor's degree in 1937. The following year he did graduate work at Georgetown University's School of Foreign Service.

Mr. Palmer's long experience in African affairs began in June 1941, when he was assigned as vice consul in Nairobi. He served there until 1945 when he returned to the Department where he worked in the Division of African Affairs and was concerned with Ethiopian matters and the disposition of the former Italian colonies in Africa.

He was promoted to Assistant Chief of the Division in October 1947 and later became Acting Chief. He went to the Embassy in London in May 1949, where he served as an African, Near Eastern, and South Asian specialist. During his tour in London he was promoted to first secretary and consul. Returning to the Department in October 1953, he was appointed Deputy Director of the Office of European Regional Affairs and in March 1955, became Acting Director.

When it was decided in 1956 to set up a separate Bureau of African Affairs, Mr. Palmer was named Deputy Assistant Secretary of State for African Affairs and given the responsibility for organizing it.

Upon completion of this task he was assigned as consul general at Salisbury, capital of the then Federation of Rhodesia and Nyasaland, in September 1958. He was accorded the personal rank of minister for this assignment.

Mr. Palmer's appointment as Ambassador to Nigeria followed in 1960. In July 1962, he was promoted to the rank of career minister in the Foreign Service. He returned to the United States in 1964 to take up his duties as Director General of the Foreign Service. His son, Joseph Woodbury, now serving with the Navy in Vietnam, was born in Africa.

Following is the address of Hon.

Joseph Palmer II at Brandeis University, Waltham, Mass., on November 9, 1966:

THE NEW AFRICA: CONTINENT OF CHANGE I. INTRODUCTION

I am deeply honored to have been invited to participate in the Harry B. Helmsley Lecture Series. I know that you will understand me, moreover, when I say that as a public servant with "a passion for anonymity"—to use Franklin Roosevelt's words—I am not a little overawed to be following such an impressive list of distinguished philosophers, educators, and religious leaders as those who have graced this platform before me.

Nevertheless, I am comforted by the fact that I am speaking in the area in which I grew up and which I therefore know to be traditionally egalitarian in its outlooks.

I also am most pleased to be able to speak to you tonight on *The New Africa: Continent of Change* at Brandeis University. I think this is particularly appropriate because this great institution has in a very short period of time acquired a well-deserved reputation for sensitive understanding of the need for change and for creative thinking, both of which are so essential to a comprehension of present day Africa.

II. THIS NEW AND CHANGING AFRICA

The emergence of 35 nations in fifteen years is—as the mathematicians might say—the outward and visible sign of a progression of change in Africa which is reaching geometric—and even exponential—proportions. The full dimensions of this change are as elusive to calculate as the definitive value of pi. Yet if we are really to understand the New Africa, this change is so all important that we must attempt to factor it however imperfectly.

New aspirations

In the comparative isolation of a colonial cocoon for generations, the African saw himself and his world in a peculiar optic. In a changing world, he found that certain of his time-honored traditions lost at least a portion of their relevance, while many of the colonial innovations failed satisfactorily to replace them. To change the verb tense of the title of a book by the Nigerian writer, Chinua Achebe, "Things Fell Apart". One of the most striking elements of the new Africa, however, is the rediscovery by Africans of themselves. Reflected most eloquently in writings of poet and political leader Leopold Senghor, the African has found a new dignity in his freedom, in his history, and in his color. It is a fascinating coincidence that in these same years the evidence is mounting that Africa may well be the cradle of earliest man. The African thus finds himself both the oldest and, in a sense, the newest of mankind.

Coinciding with the achievement of African independence and the revitalization of an African personality, there has been opened up to the people of this continent the new world of education and technology. The revolution of independence brought an explosion of education—a threefold increase in literacy in those fifteen years.

The influx of ideas has so stimulated the change in African minds that the span of generations, as far as outlook was concerned, has become as short as four or five years.

All of this has involved an acceleration of aspirations with respect to almost every aspect of human life: individual rights, economic growth, national goals and continental unity, international understanding and world peace. This is hardly surprising, particularly when one takes into account the past isolation of Africa from progress in these fields. For what independent people can justify to themselves—or to others—foregoing the fruits of the great intellectual and material advances which are the common heritage of all mankind—or of failing to

make their own unique contributions to these challenging developments?

The fact that these many nations obtained their independence in such a short time represents retrospectively the end of three major colonial empires—British, French and Belgian. Although the process of decolonization is not yet completed, the die has been cast and the significance of this great historical process belongs largely—if not yet completely—to the past. In a far more meaningful sense for the present, the end of this colonialism marks the beginning of 35 major experiments in the government of men. This experimentation is bound to produce its share of problems along with its successes. It is plagued by contradictions and disappointments along with its consistencies and achievements. And, just as in older independent societies, the process of adapting to change will be a never ending one. In spite of a bewildering variety of developments, there appear to be three trends which predominate. Together they give Africa a distinctive pattern which will probably condition its political life for the foreseeable future.

First, the dialogue between the modern and the traditional in political life has entered a new phase, both on the national and at the local level of these new nations. In the eyes of new nations, the colonial officials—hitherto the purveyors of the modern—suddenly became old-fashioned. Overnight, new powers and responsibilities were acquired, new goals were set, and an intensive sorting began out of what was really important in the body politic. The political leaders no longer were constrained to rule under benevolent governors or impelled to agitate as opponents of a foreign power. They were free to govern and propelled by the very nature of their societies to transform their governments into instruments which reflected the mores of their people. This brought into a new perspective the modern and the traditional, the national and the tribal, and the efficient and the less effective. But quite understandably, there has been no clear single answer to these conflicts. Instead, the dialogue—which occasionally has moved to dispute and disorder—has already provided a variety of responses. For example, monarchies have been renewed in some cases, parliamentary responsibility has continued in others; while presidential executive in various forms have flourished in still others. But under all of these institutional rubrics, indigenous political systems are undergoing far-reaching transformation to evolve institutions that are African in their inspiration and expression.

This thought leads to a second post-independence development which characterizes the African search for self-expression. In most of the new nations, a one-party government in one form or another has consolidated its power. But even here the pattern has not been rigid, ranging from the highly authoritarian structure in Nkrumah's Ghana to the far more flexible system obtaining in states such as Zambia. It is no surprise that the debate on the merits of this change has been widespread. For example, President Nyerere has persuasively defended the establishment of a single party in terms of need for fully utilizing all available leadership in the development of his country. And almost everywhere, the African respect for dissent has fostered an atmosphere for exposing and debating opposing ideas.

Third, another manifestation of change has been the emergence of the military as a dominant force in a number of new states. Except in Algeria, independence came with relative speed and with minimal organized fighting. The leaders of almost all of the other states came from civilian professions. For many reasons, however, the military elements in a number of the new nations lost confidence in their civilian lead-

ers. In some cases, they disapproved of corruption or became frustrated because of inefficiency. In others, they were unprepared to accept restrictions on their positions; and in still others, personal elements in a struggle for power were undoubtedly important. In the eight countries where this has taken place, however, there has been no single pattern of development. One military government has yielded to civil power; two have yielded to other military officers; some have retained important elements of the civilian government; while at least one has clearly expanded rather than restricted the political powers of civilian elements in the country.

There is little reason to believe that this process of experimentation in government and politics has any more than just begun. To underline this point, I need only refer to the concluding chapter of the study of Political Parties in French-Speaking West Africa by a distinguished Africanist, Ruth Schachter Morgenthau, in which she notes both the dynamics which developed within the parties during the surge toward independence and the implications for the future inherent in this change.

Economic change

While economic change in the new Africa has in some ways been less dramatic than the political transformation, it has certainly not been less complex. In the period of decolonization, political preparation for independence was increasingly compressed in time through crash programs of progressive self-government. The pace of economic advancement was never commensurate with this trend and the resulting situation confronted the new leadership with a tremendous gap in the task of modernizing largely subsistence, low productive and highly vulnerable economies.

The nature of Africa's economic problems can be illustrated, if not solved, by looking at the changing patterns of its production, its communications, and its trade.

In the period of colonial dependence, the pattern of African production was asymmetrical, in that the economic life was not directed toward the whole needs of the country. For example, one of the largest and most advanced activities concerned the production of sub-surface resources, with little relationship to their use in Africa. Thus, the copper, diamonds, iron ore, and other minerals were produced in terms of external use by a metropole. Alongside this modern exploitation of Africa's resources, plantation crops received heavy emphasis as part of the export activity. It is true that all of this production for foreign markets produced the foreign exchange required to import consumer goods, but there was little incentive for the colonial power to encourage the manufacture of even the simplest of these locally. And we still have the anomaly of a potentially rich agricultural continent having to import a considerable part of its food needs.

With the advent of independence a new symmetry of economic activity is emerging—one which continues a basic emphasis on exportation of mineral and agricultural resources, but which also recognizes the changing situation in Africa. Agriculture, for example, is slowly and sometimes unevenly being transformed from subsistence to cash crop production. Greater stress is being placed on indigenous food production and the need for correcting dietary deficiencies in crop concentration. One needs only see the products available in remote markets or watch the cattle coming from hundreds of miles to be sold at central points to mark the increase of the money economy throughout the Continent. Also noteworthy is the expansion of manufacturing in the new Africa. A trend in production from simple to more complex consumer goods is already evident, followed by the beginning of heavier industry and basic processing of raw materials.

Similar changes flowing from independence can be found in other areas of economic activity. The lines of communication, for example, were formerly oriented to the needs of the colonial power. Telegraph and telephone links went to the metropole, instead of to neighboring countries. Roads and railroad nets tended to be developed in conformity to the geography of political control, rather than on an economic or regional basis. With independence, the need for communication among Africans has become imperative. Hence, new African nations are most eager to link their telecommunications and enlarge the transportation facilities with each other. No more dramatic example can be cited than the preoccupations of Zambia and Tanzania with their road, rail, and pipeline links.

The pattern of African trade traditionally developed within the framework of colonial purchases, preferences and investments. Hence, the new African nations find themselves not only seeking to achieve freedom from complete dependence upon a principal external power, but they see an urgent need to develop economic relations among themselves. A common market for the whole continent may, in fact, be a goal which will take decades to reach, but as an aspiration it is high on the list of African desiderata.

III. ITS NATION-BUILDING TASKS

The building of new nations is a hazardous business. African leaders, in particular, must carry with them burdens of an onerous past. Suffering from long periods of inter-necine warfare and drained of generations of manpower through slavery, much of Africa has undergone a colonial occupation which entailed, among other things, a division of peoples and regions on the basis of great-power politics.

The resultant boundaries, of course, were a blend of diplomatic compromise and imperial conquest. They served purposes that were primarily extraneous to Africa, and they not only disregarded the elemental principles of tribal cohesion but they became linguistic walls between French and English, trading barriers between otherwise complementary economies, and sources of discord among governments and peoples.

In the new Africa, they pose so many problems that the sheer complexity of trying to give the continent sensible frontiers makes it necessary for African statesmen to affirm their sanctity. In fact, one leader is reported to have remarked that the boundaries of African countries were so absurd that it was impossible to consider changing them.

In spite of this advice, however, the question of frontiers has erupted into several disputes in the continent. The most notable have been the long-standing differences between Ethiopia and Somalia—which spill over to the south with respect to Kenya and on the north with respect to French Somaliland—and the Algerian-Moroccan boundary dispute. These, however, merely highlight the exceptions to the general rule. On the whole, the Africans deserve great credit for their mutual forbearance in accepting present borders.

The pull of the past, however, is much more than the patch-work quilt of international frontiers; it also derives from tribal inheritance, which in its original form sought to regulate the entire life of all its members. Shaken by missionary efforts—both Christian and Islamic—baffled and often broken by colonial administrators, and finally penetrated by modern communication—from press to transistor radios—tribalism is frequently able to resist change but it is rarely able to provide an enduring alternative. Hence, it has usually hampered rather than helped Africans in their task of nation building. While tribal virtues and loyalties are frequently of value to the individual in his personal life, collectively they tend to be resistant to the integrative imperatives of the modern nation state.

Nevertheless progress is being made and for every identifiable case of tribal resistance to national integration, there is a host of lesser publicized cases where the transition is taking place.

The problems of the past—and I've mentioned only two of a much larger number—have been particularly onerous to many of the leaders of Africa, whose aspirations have been equaled only by the pressures for change which have been placed upon them. Exhilarated by the momentum of rapid independence, impelled by a desire for rapid and general success, buoyed up by faith that their leaders could quickly move these mountainous problems, the peoples of many new nations quickly found out what many of their leaders already understood, namely, that independence did not in and of itself provide answers to their pressing problems. It is under these circumstances that the glamour of panaceas has been irresistible in the case of several nations.

There is another pressure on the leadership of the New Africa which is often overlooked. It might be called the Kleig-light approach to both domestic and foreign affairs. With communications much more rapid than anyone imagined a few years ago, and with travellers, journalists, international committees and diplomats in every part of the globe, the struggling leader with real problems of nation building has no alternative but to work them out in circumstances in which each untoward development is instantaneously reported—and usually interpreted—for a vast world audience of Monday morning quarterbacks. My objective in saying this is to emphasize how important it is for recipients of these reports to keep these problems in perspective and to provide an opportunity for the same considered approach to their solutions that older nations enjoyed.

Despite these problems, there is good reason to view the political prospects of nation-building in Africa with much more than just forbearance. Given the speed of independence, the limited size of administrative cadres, and the centrifugal pressures we have mentioned, the record of achievements is impressive. If the problem of cohesion within the new states is not yet solved, and that of transition from one government to another is not always peaceful, we must recognize that these are problems which have long plagued mankind in its effort to govern itself equitably and efficiently.

Economic growth in Africa, as elsewhere, is connected with the eternal triangle of man, his soil and his productive capabilities. While in many ways Africa is no different in this respect than the rest of the world, it has five particular characteristics which hold promise of beneficial change.

First, its sub-soil resources are substantial and assuming a new importance within the context of independent Africa as geological surveys are extended. The prospects in many parts of the continent are therefore bright for earning the foreign exchange resources which are so badly needed in economic development. For example, production is rapidly increasing in the copper from Zambia and the Congo, the iron ore from Gabon and Liberia, the bauxite from Guinea and Ghana, and most dramatically the oil from Algeria, Libya and Nigeria. Along with its agricultural production, these minerals have helped Africa increase its exports by one-third since the independence movement got under way.

Second, the problem of over-population is not yet as acute as in many other parts of the world. Even though some countries such as Burundi are directly afflicted and signs of large unemployment in urban centers are multiplying, the continent has at least a limited period of grace before the population increase threatens to overtake its economic expansion. We should not be complacent, however, for Africa's birth-rate is the highest of any of the underdeveloped continents. Its

death-rate is bound soon to drop as sanitation and health measures such as mass inoculation programs become more effective. As we prepare a program of smallpox eradication and measles control for 100 million persons in West Africa, we hope that the states of the area will also begin thinking about the basic issues of population control.

Third, the population question underlines the paramount importance to Africa of a genuine agricultural revolution. During the past thirty years Africa has changed from an exporting area in food products to an importing continent of even such necessities as grain and rice. Having some advantages over other parts of the world in the nature of its land ownership and exploitation, Africa nevertheless must achieve basic land reform, apply scientific knowledge, often available in the research station but not known to the farmer, counteract the frequent droughts and overcome the widespread poverty of soil. Only by such fundamental changes in its most important of all economic activity can the continent expect to advance its economic growth faster than its population increase.

Fourth, the external assistance to Africa during the past five years has totaled over \$7.8 billions, which is a higher per capita assistance than elsewhere in the underdeveloped world. Measured in terms of need, of course, this assistance has only begun to meet Africa's problems. Nevertheless, external aid has done its major share in preparing the base in a number of African countries for significant growth. Its expansion is necessary if Africa is to obtain the essential infrastructure and capital assets. As the President of the IBRD, Mr. Woods, wrote in Foreign Affairs: "The underdeveloped countries are seeking to enter the twentieth century, but many of them, in some respects, have not yet reached the nineteenth." He warns the developed nations that "it would be unthinkable for the richer nations, by their inaction, to let the developing world lose hold of its hard-won gains and lose sight of its goals."

Fifth, the substantial increase in education is one of the most heartening developments in the New Africa. For example, south of the Sahara the universities have multiplied in the past decade from a handful of small colleges to some twenty-five fully qualified institutions. Equally important, secondary education has almost tripled during this same period.

While education itself is no panacea—and the problems of school-leavers, of the wrong kind of training, and of literacy without education exist in Africa as elsewhere—it is, in the eyes of all of Africa, the greatest hope for the future. From these ranks come the new generations of leadership; from such training must come the new direction for Africa's development; from these elites will come the molders of African opinion—whether on government or economics, or on the world at large. These young men and women will be the mainstays of further African change; they, more than anyone else, will fashion the destiny of their country, for in no continent is the past more open to new leadership than in Africa.

Intellectual ferment

One of the exciting aspects of this new and changing Africa is the intellectual ferment which accompanied its emergence and which is pacing its growth.

I have already mentioned Leopold Senghor as a prophet of Negritude, but he should also be described as a president and nation-builder. In addition to his poetry, which in its glorification of one people is also speaking of mankind—Senghor is, as you know, the President of a new nation and one of the great leaders seeking to achieve a synthesis of what is good in both European and African civilization. We should also recall that Jomo Kenyatta was an anthropologist before he was caught up in the maelstrom of politics. Moving from prison to presidency in Kenya, he has also

brought with him the encouragement of learning and the support of multiracial concepts of government. In Tanzania, President Julius Nyerere is a political scientist and practical humanist, who as one of the most articulate exponents of African ideals is also the translator of Shakespeare into Swahili.

In unofficial spheres of African life, we see a burgeoning of many kinds of artistic expression. Interestingly enough, this is reflected in our own interests in African art. Not only has a Museum of African Art opened in Washington, but Howard University recently presented a special exhibit of the Nigerian sculptor Fajeye, and the Harmon Foundation in Philadelphia is presently sponsoring a major exhibition of African art. One of the more contemporary aspects of our admiration of Africa's artistic creation is discovery of African designs, colors and fabrics by America's fashion industry.

The most exciting display of the artistic upsurge of New Africa, however, was the First World Festival of Negro Arts, held at Dakar last April. Over ten thousand visitors gathered for almost a month to immerse themselves in the dance, drama and poetry of the African continent. The world also saw how it owed an artistic debt to Africa. The American participation included some of our remarkable artists in music and literature, and when they performed they spoke for both continents.

IV. TWO CHALLENGES TO ITS FUTURE

A continent as diverse as Africa cannot help but have a dynamic future. The problems which 39 nations will face in their many interrelations could not possibly be all anticipated, let alone discussed in a single evening. I would like, however, to pick out two important challenges which are increasingly facing the continent: that of continental cooperation, more frequently called the challenge of unity; and the problems of Capricorn Africa.

Just as there developed during the emergence of independent Africa aspirations concerning human dignity, political freedom and economic well-being, there also developed an affinity among Africans and a common need to support each other in their aspirations. Thus the desire for African unity became part of the struggle for national independence. If there had been a coin for all African nationalists, it might well have had the head of the national leader on one side, while the reverse would have been a map of all of the continent.

It should be added that while the most obvious manifestation of this aspiration has been the series of political conferences beginning in the late fifties, the urge has also extended to the economic area—where human rights and racial equality were projected on to the continental screen.

The Organization of African Unity, established at Addis Ababa in May 1963 was the practical result of this movement. It appropriately dedicated itself both to the defense of national sovereignty and to the achievement of continental unity. It made an eloquent appeal to the conscience of mankind in the area of human rights. Described by observers at the conference as a remarkable feat of the nearly impossible, the OAU is a reflection of both what unites and divides the continent.

In spite of crises of various sorts—varying from who shall participate to territorial disputes—the OAU has shown both endurance and adaptability. In each of its annual Summit meetings, and through its more frequent meetings of Foreign Ministers, the OAU has strengthened its organization, increased its capabilities to settle disputes, and acted as the conscience of the continent in a number of issues. Having rejected the panacea of early confederation, it has nevertheless tried repeatedly and with considerable success to develop consensus and coop-

eration in matters of deep importance to the African people.

The economic counterpart of African cooperation is the UN Economic Commission, with its headquarters also at Addis Ababa. Born in 1958, this body has the exceptionally difficult task of trying to chart and guide the economic growth of the continent. Moving with some difficulty—in part because its budget does not come directly from its members but from the United Nations—the Commission has sought to strengthen institutional cooperation throughout the continent. One offshoot of this effort has been the Development Institute at Dakar. Another recent effort is the African Development Bank, whose headquarters has opened at Abidjan.

The African approach to cooperation is above all pragmatic—a realization that welfare is not subject to territorial boundaries. African leaders, moreover, are interested in working together in many different ways. Thus, under ECA auspices subregional economic communities are being planned for different parts of the continent. Under UN auspices a series of river basin groups are being developed for several of the great arteries of Africa. In the east, there continues to be a common services organization which may well eventually provide the basis for an East African federation in one form or another. In the north, Maghrebian unity remains more of a vision than a reality, but elements of increased cooperation are present on an ad hoc basis. Other plans for regional institutional development in other parts of the continent—such as West and Central Africa—are proceeding in spite of language and historical differences. The theme often heard of “African Solutions for African Problems” is thus a challenge for the cooperative effort of the new nations of this changing continent.

Capricorn Africa

This same theme has special relevance to the second challenge to the future of Africa. The African—whether he is a student meeting you over coffee, a Foreign Minister greeting you in his office, or a clerk in a local bank—is likely to get around to the problems in the southern sixth of his continent.

Those countries and territories lying near the Tropic of Capricorn pose to the African the most basic issues affecting his life, his country, and his race:

There is a clash between the political and economic aspirations which motivate him as an individual and the tenets of the authorities of that area.

There is a denial of the principles which underlie the emergence of his new nation.

There is a challenge to accepted standards of human equality and dignity which have been written into the charters of the world community.

There is the dilemma of peaceful or violent change in each of the particular problems.

In view of these thematic problems throughout the Southern Sixth of the continent, the African naturally tends to consider the questions of Southern Rhodesia, Portuguese Territories, South West Africa and South Africa as all part of the challenge to the existence of his New Africa.

In Rhodesia, he views the domination of 94% of the population by a white minority as an affront to the principle of racial equality and majority rule.

In Angola and Mozambique, Portuguese colonialism appears to the New Africa as an example of the past frustrating the hopes for the future in an effort to reverse direction.

In South West Africa, he looks with hope on the recent UN decision terminating South Africa's mandate over this international territory and expects the realization of the territory's “inalienable right to self-determination.”

In South Africa, he sees a bastion of officially sponsored political and human in-

equality, which is also a principal source of strength for the perpetuation of minority rule in nearby territories.

Finally, he does not believe that these problems and these dilemmas are his alone. He sees them as the common responsibility of the world conscience. So, I am glad to be able to say, does the United States.

V. AFRICA AND THE WORLD

The New Africa has been preoccupied with its own national and continent problems, but this does not mean that it has had no interest in the rest of the world. In fact, one of the dramatic results of the independence movement in Africa was to change drastically its representation in the United Nations—from four to thirty-nine members. The African leaders, however, faced their new role in the world with minimum of training and a maximum of handicaps. Having little prior experience in the field of foreign affairs, they had to pull men from all professions to represent them abroad and to train additional staff almost instantaneously. With many problems of rapid change and even instability at home, these new diplomats and their leaders found themselves called upon to deal with some of the major international issues of all times.

In choosing a foreign policy path, the Africans have all elected non-alignment. Admittedly, this meant many things to many leaders, but it has certain common elements. Essentially non-alignment has sought to do four things:

It has tried, first, to achieve on a continental basis what President Washington advised early in our own history on a national basis, an avoidance of entangling alliances.

It has been concerned, second, with obtaining the time and opportunity for African nations to concentrate on their own internal political and economic development.

It has searched, third, for an African consensus with respect to important world issues, for while most African nations wish to avoid individual alignment they have not sought neutrality or isolation. Instead, they want to exercise together an influence which they know they cannot expect to exert as single states.

It has hoped, fourth, to obtain for the continent a certain immunity from dangers to its existence through such arrangements as a nuclear free zone.

VI. CONCLUSION

I have this evening tried to give something of the feel of the New Africa in a changing continent. In so doing, I have deliberately avoided the specifics of our policies towards the continent. In turning from these comments to my conclusion, however, I would like to recall to you certain essential themes which President Johnson elaborated last May, on the occasion of the third anniversary of the Organization of African Unity.

First, that there is a close identity between the people of the United States and those of Africa in their aspirations for freedom, equality, justice and dignity.

Secondly, that there is a close bond between our two continents in our common experiences with political development, economic progress, and search for human rights.

Thirdly, that we wish to see Africa succeed in the tasks that it is setting for itself and that we stand prepared to assist it in this great undertaking.

Responding to the best of our ability to African hopes and aspirations, the President proposed that we strengthen our assistance to Africa in those areas, such as regional organization, telecommunications, transport, education and agriculture, where we have a special contribution to make, and which are also essential for the advancement of the African continent as a whole.

It is our fervent hope that, together with other nations which wish Africa well, we can effectively assist the New Africa to achieve its goals and to realize its full poten-

tial as a vital, dynamic force in a world of change.

Following is the text of the address by the Honorable Joseph Palmer II, Assistant Secretary of State for African Affairs, at Muskingum College, New Concord, Ohio, on November 10, 1966:

AMERICAN INTERESTS IN AFRICA

I am indeed happy to be here with you in New Concord this evening. I consider it a signal honor to be invited to address such a distinguished audience of scholars and students of Africa.

Speaking on behalf of those in your Government who are concerned with African affairs, I wish to congratulate President Manley and the members of the faculty at Muskingum who have had the vision to organize this conference and to bring together so many of the outstanding authorities on Africa. The emphasis given to African art, literature and drama, which so well illustrates the creativity of the African peoples, is particularly to be commended.

This conference—and others like it held each year in the United States—is indicative of the intense interest in this country in Africa—a continent which has become such a significant factor in the global relationships of the United States in the post-war period. There is every indication that this trend will continue and intensify—a fact which underlines the strong national interest of deepening our understanding of and sensitivity to the aspirations and motivations of the African peoples.

UNITED STATES INTERESTS IN AFRICA

We risk a double error in considering the interests of the United States in Africa. Those of us in government and private life who deal with Africa's problems throughout the day—and frequently at night, for crises have a habit of ignoring union hours—perhaps too often take these interests as being widely understood and accepted. They are in fact the matrix of our activities—the premises on which we formulate our policies and programs. To others, whose exposure to this vast and often bewildering continent may be somewhat less intensive, the interests of the United States in the fifty nations and territories making up Africa may not be as apparent. It might therefore be helpful to outline what I believe to be the essential American interests in Africa.

The initial—and indeed underlying—interest of the United States in Africa springs from the practical implications of common aspirations. We realize that in the long run we cannot expect to enjoy peace and prosperity unless the people of Africa can also realize the same fundamental goals which we ourselves seek. The time is long past—if it ever existed—when nations can practice the self-deception of double standards. Our nation was founded on the right of self-determination; we cannot do otherwise than support that aspiration for others. We have committed ourselves to government by the consent of the governed and to individual rights and dignity at home; we have no alternative, consistent with our national character, to seeking their realization abroad. We have recognized the fundamental congruity between the well-being of every citizen and the health of our nation; we cannot ignore the imperatives of a similar relationship in Africa where the gap is often too wide between economic and social progress on the one hand and political responsibility for achieving such advancement on the other.

It is significant, in my opinion, that President Johnson, with his deep dedication to the effective realization of human rights and of economic and social opportunity in this country, emphasized these points at the beginning of his speech last May 26, on the occasion of the Third Anniversary of the Organization of African Unity, when he said:

“The United States has learned from

lamentable personal experience the waste and injustice that result from the domination of one race by another. Just as we are determined to remove the remnants of inequality from our own midst, we are also with you [the Africans]—heart and soul—as you try to do the same."

The American interest has a second cornerstone, with roots that also run deep into our history. From the tragic generations of men and women brought to this country in bondage, we have gained in strength as we have increasingly realized the potential for a dynamic contribution to our national life of the second largest emigrant population of African origin in the world. Only Brazil outranks the United States in this respect. But it is the role and contribution of the Negro American that gives this interest in Africa a special importance. Not only are these Americans naturally proud of their ancestral origins and heritage; they are also making their national contribution to American policy and presence in Africa—some as Ambassadors and Foreign Service Officers, others as AID officials, still others in our information services and Peace Corps, while many more serve in the wide ranging activities undertaken by private endeavor. In holding high the banner of civil rights and human dignity in a country which reads and responds to responsible demands, the American Negro also lends encouragement and inspiration to those seeking such rights in Africa and, indeed, elsewhere in the world.

A third element of our interest in this continent is a direct result of Africa's changing role in world affairs. In an explosion of independence, colonial Africa has produced thirty-five new nations in less than two decades. One dramatic result of this is the transformation of Africa's role in the United Nations. The African Group of 38 members casts more votes than any other continent. Along with Asians, the Africans can, if they wish, command a majority in the General Assembly. The fact that on most issues they do not wield this weapon, but vote according to their national consciences and interests is often obscured by the far fewer occasions on which they feel a compelling sense of solidarity on a given problem. It is not enough for us in such circumstances to write their viewpoints off as emotionalism. Rather, we must try to probe for the premises that lead them to the conclusions they reach—and to assure that they understand ours.

Fourthly, there are the more material interests which assume importance in this increasingly interrelated world at a time of rapidly advancing technology. African facilities are important to our worldwide communications network, and we have important space-age ties with Africa. Our manned space flights are tracked by stations in Africa, and African facilities are cooperating in other space experiments and operations which hold great promise for the advancement of their—as well as our—knowledge and development.

Moreover, from Africa's extensive mineral resources we purchase products of critical importance to our science and technology. Our machine tool industry, for example, relies heavily on Africa's industrial diamonds. Other rare African metals, such as beryllium, columbium and tantalum, are essential to our industrial and scientific community because of their ability to resist heat and corrosion. From Africa's agricultural capacity, we buy increasing quantities of coffee and cocoa. In Africa's commerce and investment we are finding larger opportunities for mutually advantageous business arrangements which contribute substantially to development and understanding. Even though our volume of trade and investment with Africa is relatively small in relationship to the total, it has both more than doubled in the past decade and a half, and has opened up with vast new areas which were closed to use during the colonial era. Two dramatic

examples suffice: American companies have helped the Government of Libya to transform the economy of that country through their discovery and production of oil; similarly, in Liberia, large American investments have been instrumental in developing the great iron ore resources and natural rubber potential to the benefit of that oldest republic in Africa.

Fifth, world geography and world security give Africa still another significance to the United States and to all other nations who seek peace and freedom. One need only glance at the map to realize the interrelationship between the security of Africa and that of Europe and Asia. Similarly, one need only compare the latitudes of Africa with those of the Western Hemisphere to verify the extent of the Atlantic proximity of the two land masses—from the Carolinas on the north to the lower part of Argentina on the south. In today's world, the Mediterranean and Red Seas have become ponds, while the Atlantic and Indian oceans have shrunk to lakes. It is vital to the mutual interest of both Africa and the United States that these contracted bodies of water—and the even more constricted airspace above them—should be roads of peaceful intercourse to the advantage of all.

AFRICAN REALITIES

Because of our significant interests in Africa, let us be certain we have a clear understanding of the basic realities of African life. In these realities we find problems that are both obvious and obscure, and characteristics which are both common to mankind and unique in their African context.

Africa is enormous and blessed with great human and natural resources. But the realization of this huge potential is too widely limited by poverty, disease and illiteracy. The reasons for this are to a considerable extent locked in the colonial past. But they are also found in tradition and resistance to change that become entrenched by Africa's long isolation. Whatever the explanation, incomes average less than \$125 per capita annually; chronic illness debilitates much of its population; and illiteracy persists in almost 85% of its peoples.

Moreover, most African states are basically producers of primary products, whose foreign exchange earnings are their principal means of obtaining the manufactured products required to raise their standards of living. Often single crop countries, African states depend upon the world prices for their economic welfare. The wide fluctuations in price-levels of cocoa, coffee, peanuts, cotton and copper—to mention a few—do two things to African countries; they recurrently jolt and demoralize their economies, and they cause frustration and bitterness between the African and industrialized nations. The former makes planning difficult; the latter accentuates the psychological gap between the Rich Nations and the Poor.

All African nations suffer from inadequately trained manpower. This inhibits production, restricts ability to absorb aid, curtails reform, detracts from efficiency, and limits mobilization of even the modest capital resources available. In no area is this more true than agriculture, where primitive methods are often made still more ineffective by outmoded land systems, inefficient tools and lack of water.

Every African nation needs better transportation, and truly regional networks of any sort have hardly been started. Communications links persist from the colonial periods, still tying many African nations more closely to their former metropolises than to their neighbors.

These are the realities of the past. But the new Africa—the recently independent Africa along with its older nations—reflects present and future realities of a very different nature.

The first, and most important, of these newer realities is the continuing drive for freedom and independence. Having achieved

this independence in most of the continent, African peoples are determined to consolidate their gain. Benefitting from the largely peaceful nature of this transition, African leaders are intent on achieving real political and economic development.

A second reality is independent Africa's abiding concern with self-determination and majority rule for all of its peoples. There are major territories, especially in Southern Africa, in which neither the principle of self-determination nor of majority rule has been applied. On this issue, the African consensus is clear. They want responsible, effective and timely action, and they expect others to match their professions with their deeds.

A third reality is the African aspiration for unity. This assertion may sound questionable, in light of the disputes and divisions which persistently exist in Africa. But this view fails to take into account both the trends of events in Africa and the way Africans look at this aspiration. A broad basis for continental cooperation is emerging in the Organization of African Unity and the UN Economic Commission for Africa. While the ideal of full unity remains a distant goal, Africans are developing the practical steps of cooperation in both the political and economic spheres. The pressure for greater cooperation lies in their realization of their individual weaknesses; the benefits of regional effort are being more widely recognized; and the institutions to make this cooperation meaningful are being constructed.

A fourth reality is Africa's desire to be free of foreign intervention. Occasionally, taking the form of emotional attacks on neo-colonialism, this spirit is most generally reflected in the African desire for non-alignment. Springing historically from two sentiments—an instinctive suspicion of colonialism and an intense desire to stay out of great power conflict—non-alignment has different meanings for different African leaders. At its core, however, it is generally a search for genuine independence and a desire as Africans to express themselves in their own ways—both aspirations with which we can completely identify ourselves.

U.S. OBJECTIVES

Against the background of these African realities, and in light of the United States interest in Africa, let us define our fundamental foreign policy objectives in Africa.

The primary objective of all U.S. foreign policy is, of course, the security and well-being of the United States, and this consideration is basic to our African policy. Fortunately for the peoples of both continents, there is nothing inconsistent between this basic concern and what Africa wants for itself. In today's interdependent world, we can best guarantee our own safety and prosperity by directing our policy toward the building of a world of peace and freedom. Our credentials are enhanced by the fact that we have no territorial or other special ambitions in Africa, nor elsewhere. We understand that the best guarantee of our own independence and prosperity is the independence and prosperity of others. These are the guarantees of American national interests.

Our basic objectives in Africa are, therefore:

1. Responsiveness to the efforts of Africa to develop effective governments reflecting their own aspirations and capable of bringing about peaceful and sustained progress for the African people. We believe that such governments will place their own interests ahead of those of any foreign power and will reject imperialism and subversion, whatever their forms.

2. Assistance to African nations in their efforts to develop economic, educational and social institutions which will provide the means of meeting the peoples' needs for a better life.

3. Support to African efforts to develop national, regional and inter-African political institutions which will permit African countries to play increasingly constructive roles in the world community of nations.

4. The long-term growth of American trade and investment in a manner that will serve the needs of both Africans and Americans.

5. The development of comprehensive African-American ties which will enhance U.S.-African friendship.

U.S. POLICY IN AFRICA

Having defined our objectives, the problem is: what policies should we adopt to govern our relations with African countries? The United States has developed a broad, and I believe realistic, policy toward Africa. It is calculated to further American interests in the most favorable long-range sense of the word.

Five basic principles govern American policy toward Africa. Of those five principles, self-determination—and the several corollaries that flow from it—is the first and most important.

We support the right of African peoples to choose their own future. American policy has consistently supported the right of the African people to opt for independence or self-government. Whenever political change is indicated, the United States strongly supports a peaceful transition. We believe that the interests of all concerned can best be served by a progressive approach, over a reasonable period of time, within a framework of agreement by all parties. This continues to be our policy with respect to those areas of the continent that continue under colonial rule.

For example, the recent transition to independence by Botswana and Lesotho, which was worked out between the people of those states and the Government of the United Kingdom, fulfills not only our definition of self-determination, but also our belief as to the best means of realizing it.

On the other hand, we have given every encouragement and support to the efforts of the United Kingdom and the United Nations to restore legitimate government in Southern Rhodesia following last year's illegal declaration of independence by the Smith regime. What has happened in Southern Rhodesia is a complete negation of what we mean by self-determination. As President Johnson said on May 26 in emphasizing the importance of restoring legitimate government in Southern Rhodesia: "Only when this is accomplished can steps be taken to open the full power and responsibility of nationhood to all the people of Rhodesia—not just six per cent of them."

Another aspect of United States support of self-determination is that we believe in government by the consent of the governed, which is broader even than formal independence. The Republic of South Africa has independence, but it certainly does not have consent of the majority of the governed. Nor does South Africa's policy of apartheid—to which the United States is completely and unalterably opposed—portend that there will soon be a government with consent of the governed. American policy has sought by every appropriate means to convince the South African Government that apartheid contains the seeds of its own destruction. We seek to suggest no special formula to South Africa, but rather we would hope in due course to see a dialogue develop between the government and representatives of all citizens, including those with no present effective representative voice in government.

Our policy of self-determination also embraces our support for the free choice by African peoples of their own form of government and society as long as they respect the rights of others. We applaud the fact that the new African governments are desirous of developing their own political and social institutions in their own image and likeness and in a manner best calculated to reflect the

traditions and aspirations of the African peoples. We hope that they—as we hope others will in this process accord equal rights and opportunities to all persons residing in their country.

United States understanding of and respect for a policy of nonalignment is a logical extension of our support of self-determination. There is sometimes a tendency to categorize foreign countries as being "pro-this" or "pro-that" without fully realizing that a country can be seeking the same kind of a world we seek without necessarily being aligned with us on all international issues. To view Africa's current problems as though they were primarily manifestations of the East-West conflict is a dangerous oversimplification of Africa's preoccupations.

Perhaps the reason for our relative diplomatic successes in Africa—as compared to communist countries—has been precisely because we have understood that the first task of the leaders of Africa was to protect the interests of Africa. Thus, we have gone to great lengths to encourage this kind of healthy non-involvement, as for example, in our support of the UN effort in the Congo.

The second main principle of United States African policy is encouragement of African solutions to African problems and support of institutions through which solutions can be reached. The United States has welcomed and encouraged the Organization of African Unity in its efforts to bring about responsible solutions to disputes among its members, such as the border problems between Algeria and Morocco and between Ethiopia and Somalia. Moreover the Organization subsumes a wide range of other cooperative activities supportive, in the words of its charter, "of the inalienable right of all people to control their own destiny." As President Johnson has said "My country knows what these words mean. To us, as to you, they are not abstractions. They are a living part of our experience as men and as nations."

The United States has also welcomed and encouraged the creation of the United Nations Economic Commission for Africa, which is actively seeking ways to boost African economic growth. The two major results of this growing activity have been the establishment of the African Development Institute at Dakar and the African Development Bank at Abidjan. The ECA has also sponsored the development of subregional economic communities to integrate efforts of the nations in four subregions of the continent.

The third principle of our African policy is our support of African economic development and independence through aid and trade.

In Africa, aid is a vital addition to indigenous efforts to achieve a rate of economic and social growth responsive to the requirements of political stability. Any government—however progressive and constructive and however cloaked with the prestige of having won independence—that fails to reckon with its people's desire for progress will find itself in jeopardy, with order and stability gravely disturbed. This not only adversely affects the country involved, but, as I said earlier, could create a situation affecting the peace and security of the United States as well.

African governments are not yet of and by themselves able to generate the thrust required for the economic and social improvement to meet the needs of their peoples. They must obtain aid or risk deepening troubles. The key questions are from whom aid will be sought, whether it can be obtained on acceptable terms, and when it can be delivered and put to work. It is worth noting that in almost every instance the newly independent nations of Africa turn first to the West as their preferred primary source of aid, and look elsewhere either to demonstrate their non-alignment or because they are disappointed by the Western response.

In recent years our over-all aid program

for Africa has embraced a variety of methods—grants and loans, technical and supporting assistance, development and research, help through international organizations, Food for Peace, and the Peace Corps. The emphasis has generally been on a bilateral, rather than multilateral or regional approach.

One important guiding principle of our assistance to Africa is to make available skills and experience rather than to try to transplant American methods and institutions. It is up to the Africans who are responsible for building their continent to decide whether our particular talent and accomplishments are adaptable to what they are trying to achieve. If they believe they are, we are ready to assist to the extent we can. If they believe our concepts are not suitable to their environment, we look to them to tell us so, since to apply what won't work is neither in their interests nor ours.

Within this context of responding to African desires and initiatives, the President last May suggested the paths along which the United States might work in assisting African development. They were, in particular—

(1) To strengthen the regional economic activities already emerging in Africa.

(2) To increase the number of trained Africans through helping expand regional centers of excellence and assisting students to attend them.

(3) To help develop Africa's regional infrastructure, such as regional power and air, road and rail links.

(4) To assist the growth of agriculture, the expansion of investments, and other essential needs.

(5) And to put to work in Africa the great technological advances that are being made, particularly in the field of telecommunications and communications satellites.

Under the President's directive, representatives of the various agencies concerned with aid to Africa are undertaking a comprehensive review of American development assistance in order to find ways and means of making it more effective and responsive to Africa's needs. We are restudying, with international institutions and other governments, means by which our aid, in conjunction with aid from other donors, can best maximize assistance to Africa in its national, subregional, and continental dimensions.

The fourth main principle of our policy toward Africa is our desire to discourage arms build-ups beyond the needs of internal security or legitimate self defense. Given the very limited economic resources of the newly independent countries, most of them realize the importance of concentrating their resources on economic and social development, rather than on expensive and non-productive weaponry. Regrettably this simple rule of thumb is not everywhere applied, and in a few areas the race is already on with escalating acquisitions as one state tries to get ahead of its neighbor. The key to this problem is mutual self denial and cooperative restraint, concepts which we hope the nations of Africa will examine and adopt before local tragedies ensue.

The fifth, and final, principle of our African policy is to encourage other free world countries, and particularly the former European metropolises, to enlarge their responsibilities toward assisting Africa. With few exceptions, colonial ties have been laid aside for new types of cooperative arrangements between Africa and Europe based on equality, mutual respect and reciprocal advantage. And, where African aspirations for independence and dignity have been satisfied, it has been the African nations themselves who have sought fruitful and continuing relations with former metropolises. We consider this sound policy, and we are pleased that the new cultural, economic and other cooperative relationships between the former metropolises and the newly independent

ent African countries are, in most instances, close, cordial and mutually beneficial.

CONCLUSION

There are, of course, strong external forces which seek to frustrate the principles which I have described during the course of this talk. We have seen them at work in various parts of the continent. Their methods are sometimes blatant but more often subtle and deceptive. Nevertheless, the events of the past few years have demonstrated clearly that Africa's leaders themselves are generally alert to unacceptable encroachments on their hard-won independence and prepared to act to resist them. While the danger remains of African miscalculation regarding an acceptable level of communist influence, it can generally be said that our support of African efforts to strengthen their independence and advance their development is, in the long run, the surest guarantee we could have that Africa will remain in the world of free choice.

In closing, I would like to recall the words of a wise African leader who once said to me, "I hope that you Americans will look upon our efforts to build a nation in the full light of your own early history. If you do, you will understand the excitement we feel as we assume the responsibility for the conduct of our own affairs. And you will also better understand the magnitude of the challenge which we face in building a cohesive and prosperous society from many diverse elements. So as you watch our efforts, please remember these elements of your own history."

If we keep in mind this perspective, we can have well-founded confidence in the continent of Africa, and we can also have well-founded confidence that the principles of our policy will have a relevance to Africa beyond the crisis of the moment as we move together towards goals to which both of our continents are committed.

PRESIDENTIAL UNIT CITATION FOR THE 761ST TANK BATTALION

Mr. ANNUNZIO. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. ANNUNZIO. Mr. Speaker, I am reintroducing in the Congress today a bill to authorize and request the President of the United States to award a Presidential Unit Citation to the 761st Tank Battalion because I feel this recognition of the gallant 761st is long overdue.

It was during World War II that the 761st compiled its impressive record of almost 400 battle awards, including Purple Hearts, Silver Stars, Bronze Stars, Certificates of Merit, and the high praise of the War Department.

The 761st Tank Battalion was the first armored unit in the history of the American Army to enter combat with Negroes manning its weapons and vehicles. The battalion was activated in April 1942 at Camp Claiborne, La., and in its first encounter with the enemy, the 761st lived up to the highest expectations. The men fought gallantly and their ingenuity and ability carried them through the grimmest and most difficult situations.

The records show that after the 761st had been in combat less than 2 months,

the commanding general of the Headquarters XII Corps, issued a special commendation, saying:

I consider the 761st Tank Battalion to have entered combat with such conspicuous courage and success as to warrant special commendation. The speed with which they adapted themselves to the front line under most adverse weather conditions, the gallantry with which they emerged from their recent engagements in the vicinity of Dieuze, Morville le Vic, and Guebling entitle them surely to consider themselves the veteran 761st.

Mr. Speaker, it is a matter of record that in the battles of Morville, Metz, Obreck Dieuze, Guebling, Tillet, and countless others, the men of the 761st conducted themselves admirably under stress and the relentless fire of the enemy. I want to refer particularly to the rugged fighting at Tillet, the heavy casualties sustained by both sides, and finally, the retreat of the crack German 13th SS Panzer Division as the 761st Tank Battalion pushed forward and turned the tide.

Courage and bravery of this high caliber deserves to be remembered. Indeed, the pages of American military history would not be complete without official recognition of the 761st Tank Battalion, which fought with valor in France, Belgium, Luxembourg, Holland, Germany, and Austria.

Therefore, I am requesting my colleagues to give their support to my measure providing for a Presidential Unit Citation for the 761st Tank Battalion. This recognition is long overdue and should be extended now.

WASHINGTON POST RECOMMENDS CHAIRMAN MARTIN RETIRE FROM FEDERAL RESERVE BOARD

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, the current Chairman of the Federal Reserve Board, William McChesney Martin, Jr., just last week publicly launched his campaign for reappointment by President Johnson. Mr. Martin's 4-year term as Chairman expires this March 31 and his 14-year term as a Board member expires on January 31, 1970. He is ineligible to serve on the Board beyond that time.

While espousing an almost pathological fear and distrust of "politics" and popular rule, particularly as related to the Nation's monetary policies, Mr. Martin is generally regarded as one of Washington's most astute politicians. By publicly announcing his willingness to step aside if President Johnson desires to appoint another as Chairman, Mr. Martin has thus sought to bring Wall Street pressure to bear on President Johnson to keep him on. The profits of the large Wall Street banks set new records for 1966, a year when Mr. Martin's high interest rates broke a 40-year record. Mr. Martin really outdid himself.

Naturally, the Rockefellers and the Morgans like to have Mr. Martin running the Federal Reserve because it lines their pockets with gold, even if it results, among other things, in the devastation of the homebuilding industry, as actually happened.

It is truly remarkable that Mr. Martin should indulge in this little game of political intrigue. Just 13 months ago he openly defied the President, acting despite Mr. Johnson's low interest program. President Johnson strongly reiterated the dangers of high interest rates and tight money in his state of the Union message just this week. Will Martin once again impose his high interest bias in the face of President Johnson's remarks that—

Our greatest disappointment in the economy during 1966 was the excessive rise in interest rates and the tightening of credit. . . . And I pledge the American people that I will do everything in a President's power to lower interest rates and to ease money in this country.

Hopefully, Chairman Martin will follow the suggestion in the Washington Post editorial of January 10 that he resign from the Federal Reserve Board and "give the Board a greater opportunity to refashion its defective tools of monetary policy." While devoted and dedicated to his principles, Mr. Martin's ideas are those one associates with 19th century European central bankers, rather than the problems and goals of an active and growing 20th century American economy.

The entire Washington Post editorial follows:

CHAIRMAN MARTIN'S TENURE

Speculation about the tenure of Mr. William McChesney Martin, the Chairman of the Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System, is something of a quadrennial event in Washington. He has served in the post for 16 years and because of the aura of virtue with which myth surrounds him, the reappointment of Mr. Martin is regarded by some as a test of a President's allegiance to "sound" monetary policy. "Soundness" in this context connotes a morbid fear of inflation and the assignment of so high a priority to price stability as to purchase it through excessively high unemployment and a very low rate of economic growth.

Although he espoused opposite views, the late President Kennedy not only reappointed Mr. Martin to the chairmanship in 1963 but strengthened his position on the Board with the appointment of a stout supporter to an unexpired term. President Johnson, notwithstanding the criticisms that are now leveled against him by wrong-headed purveyors of the "new economics," perceived the conflict between a chronically restrictive monetary policy and the requirements for rapid economic growth and never attempted to conceal it. The three Johnson appointments to the Board were calculated to achieve a more expansionary monetary policy.

Mr. Martin is a thoroughly admirable gentleman and a devoted public servant. But it is highly unlikely that he will ever again exert so strong an influence on this country's monetary policies as he did in the 1950s. His reappointment, in view of the changes that have been made in the Board and its professional staff, would not be so harmful at this juncture as it would be under different circumstances. Yet it would be far better to give Mr. Martin a well-deserved respite from public responsibilities and to give the Board a greater opportunity to refashion its defective tools of monetary policy.

RURAL ELECTRIC PUBLICATIONS ATTACK HIGH INTEREST RATES

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, members of rural electric cooperatives throughout the Nation have always been in the frontlines of the battle against high interest rates and tight money.

Their concern can be well understood. It is always the rural areas and the farmers who are hit hardest and first by the destructive consequences of high interest rates. The farmer depends heavily on credit and interest charges are always a substantial part of his budget.

Rural communities are hard pressed for loan funds to meet the most basic development needs. When credit gets tight, it is invariably the rural school district and the small town that are cut off first.

In recent days, two outstanding publications in the rural electric field—the Indiana Rural News and the East River, S. Dak., Guardian—have analyzed the interest rate situation as it affects their areas. Both of these editorials are excellent and reflect opinion at the real grassroots of America.

I place these editorials in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the East River (S. Dak.) Guardian, November 1966]

TIGHT MONEY POLICIES ENDANGER FARM, BUSINESS

Times are critical for the American farmer. He is being forced to walk a financial tightrope.

The Agriculture Department points out farmers spent \$1 out of every \$7 they earned last year to pay interest charges on loans. Prospects appear darker after the Federal Reserve Board "seized independence," without benefit of law, creating chaotic financial conditions on the farm and throughout the country.

At the request of President Johnson, the Farm Credit Administration is cooperating with federal lending agencies to limit loans, supposedly reducing "inflationary pressures." But on the other hand, the Farm Credit Administration says it wants to supply money to farmers and farmer-cooperative borrowers for 1967 production needs.

The Farm Credit Board has adopted a policy stand which said inflationary pressures can be lessened most effectively by making loans that result in maximum agricultural production. The board said the President asked that loans be made only to meet essential and non-postponable needs and that the agencies reduce borrowings in the private money market.

An overpowering fact remains: farm and other credit needs will be higher in 1967 than this year. Tight money is behind the high interest rates being clamped down on farmers.

High interest costs prevailing throughout the economy are the results of actions by a single agency—the Federal Reserve Board. The board, acting in defiance of the President and Congress, raised interest rates 37½ per cent on Dec. 6, 1965.

Since 1953, the Federal Reserve Board has become more and more defiant. The board

has warped and twisted the laws governing its operation, to move it closer to complete control by a handful of big banks holding \$16.5 billion in certificates of deposit.

What can we do about this? The Federal Reserve System must be brought back under the control of Congress. The Federal Reserve must be made to come to Congress for appropriations. Its books must be made subject to the General Accounting Office, as are other agencies of the government. Open market operations must be carried out in the public's interest and not in big bankers' interests.

East River resolutions the last two years make it clear that we feel the Federal Reserve Board is endangering the economic well-being of the entire nation through its actions.

Rising interest rates are siphoning off billions of dollars that should be channeled into productive projects. Instead, the money goes only to money lenders.

Frankly, Congress has not been doing its duty in the area of monetary affairs. Congress should take action now to make sure that monetary matters are brought under the control of the people. Only a strong demand for action from the grass roots can bring this about.

Let our congressional delegation know how you feel. They want to know your views.

[From the Indiana Rural News, December 1966]

DECISION IS OURS

With monetary conditions worsening, what can the average Hoosier do to fight for lower interest rates and relieve the "tight money" policy that has been adopted by the Federal Reserve Board?

This country, as a result of high interest rates, is facing a serious problem and a possible major disruption in its economy.

Laying full blame on the Federal Reserve Board and its closed door operations for the current monetary crisis, Representative Wright Patman of Texas declares:

"Outside of the top secret Central Intelligence Agency, no agency in our Federal Government operates with more secrecy than the Federal Reserve."

All other agencies of the Government, points out Mr. Patman, come before Congress each year for authorizations and appropriations. This permits the activities of the agencies to be reviewed in great detail. Through the years this has prevented the bureaucratic processes from becoming out of balance with the public interest. As a further safeguard, these same agencies are subject to the audit by the General Accounting Office.

But, emphasizes Congressman Patman, the Federal Reserve Board does not come to Congress for appropriations. Its books are not audited by the General Accounting Office. As a result, Mr. Patman says, the Congress, the President and the American People are completely in the dark about what is going on at the Federal Reserve.

In the 90th Congress, Mr. Patman plans to introduce legislation to bring the Federal Reserve System back under the control of the people and their elected representatives. His proposal will require that the terms of the members of the Federal Reserve Board be reduced from fourteen to five years and that the term of the chairman be made co-terminous with that of the President of the United States. The Patman bill also would direct the Federal Reserve to come to the Congress for annual appropriations and that most of the \$42-billion in bonds, presently being held by the Federal Reserve, be retired. The bill, in addition, would direct the Federal Reserve to open its books to a General Accounting Office audit and to make public the records.

One of the most fantastic examples of the attitude of the Federal Reserve as far as the public is concerned is its portfolio of \$42-billion in U.S. Bonds which are held by the Federal Reserve Bank in New York. These are bonds which have been paid off once, yet the Federal Reserve continues to hold them and to charge American taxpayers \$1.7-billion in interest annually.

The Federal Reserve uses these interest payments, says Congressman Patman, to carry on its far-flung operations, including salaries, huge expense accounts and other incidentals of the Board. Also included are about \$90,000 in annual dues to the American Bankers Association and various state and local banking associations, which, in turn, lobby for the bank interests.

Whatever is done about returning our monetary system to the people will depend largely upon the people themselves. If Hoosiers want action, they must let their elected representatives at all levels know their desires. The 90th Congress will act if the demand from the people grows strong enough.

The real decision is in our hands.

STUDY OF BANK STOCK OWNERSHIP AND CONTROL—EDITORIAL COMMENT AND REPLY

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, on January 4 of this year the Journal of Commerce printed an editorial which was highly critical of a House Banking and Currency Committee report entitled "Bank Stock Ownership and Control." This editorial contained several inaccuracies and drew some erroneous conclusions. Therefore, I wrote a letter to the Journal of Commerce discussing these points. This letter was published on Wednesday, January 11. My letter was accompanied by a short editor's note.

While the editorial, my letter, and the editor's note speak for themselves, it seems to me quite significant that the Journal of Commerce now acknowledges that a potential conflict of interest may exist when a commercial bank holds and votes a large block of its own shares held in trust for the benefit of others. Since this seems to be a widespread practice among large commercial banks, both national and State chartered, I think it is clear that further investigation and consideration of congressional legislative action be given to this problem.

Under unanimous consent, I include the editorial, my letter, and the editor's note at this point in the RECORD:

[From the Journal of Commerce and Commercial, New York, Jan. 4, 1967]

To Go To So Much

After wasting for several years a considerable amount of taxpayers' money in exploring something that didn't really need to be explored, the House Banking and Currency Committee headed by Rep. Wright Patman has come up with a staff report which Mr. Patman says reveals a "startling degree" of interlocking stock ownership among commercial banks, insurance companies and mu-

tual savings banks. If the staff report is not a lot of twaddle, Mr. Patman's deductions from it certainly are. It is a matter of going to so much to come to so little.

Mr. Patman notes that, according to the report, 5 per cent of the stock or more in almost three-fourths of the nation's largest banks is held by other financial institutions, including banks. Mr. Patman then makes the startling observation that "in corporations where stock is widely held, this 5 per cent often represents actual control."

That, of course is pure nonsense. We have heard that in some corporations 20 per cent of stock in a single place may, under favorable conditions, represent working control. We have never heard of anybody controlling a corporation of any kind by owning 5 per cent of it.

The staff report on which Mr. Patman has made such reckless deductions utilized a net which caught only a few minnows. It was based upon reports from some 3,200 banks, bank nominees, brokerage firms, insurance companies, mutual savings banks and various foundations, together with various corporations. The questionnaires sent out were aimed at determining who "beneficial owners" were.

Let us assume that this cross section of stock ownership represents a varied number of true investors, who obviously included bank trust accounts, in which enormous amounts of stock are held for single or multiple investors. What is so surprising in the fact that as much as 5 per cent or even more of the stock in financial and other institutions should be so owned? People invest in bank stocks as well as in industrial stocks, and they naturally tend to buy stocks which have a long record of excellent earnings and dividends. Banks are pre-eminent on the list of long time dividend payers.

Two years ago Mr. Patman tried hard to draw wrong conclusions from a survey of the 20 largest stockholders of record in member banks of the Federal Reserve system. The study was concentrated upon the 300 largest banks in the United States. It produced nothing of startling import and got nowhere. Not even eyebrows were raised.

Now, on the basis of the wider sampling, Mr. Patman says that his staff report "raises serious questions concerning the use and management of trust funds by banks." Also, that this aspect needs another close look by his committee to determine the need for future legislative action. Let us hope that Congress will not authorize more money to be poured down this particular rathole. Apparently Mr. Patman is hopeful of more unnecessary appropriations for this purpose.

After all, what stocks banks hold for others and how they vote them are determined by the real owners of the securities. The banks are merely agents. With some clearly defined exceptions banks are not allowed to hold stocks for their own accounts.

Mr. Patman professes to find something unhealthy in the fact that between 70 and 75 per cent of 275 large banks report 5 per cent or more of their stock held by financial institutions and that over 54 per cent of them have 10 per cent or more of their stock so held. Well, why shouldn't sophisticated investors naturally gravitate toward successful and money-making institutions such as these large banks? Some of the banks have 25 per cent to 50 per cent of their stock so held. Presumably "financial institutions" include bank holding companies, some of which own all but directors' qualifying shares of banks included in their groups.

The idea that all big banks control each other is something that one would expect to be stressed 50 years ago, when everything connected with Wall Street, LaSalle St. or Montgomery Street was supposed to be hot stuff politically. But in this day and age, when so many billions of stocks are held by

institutional investors, usually on behalf of somebody else, we feel Mr. Patman's alarm is fanciful; he is, in fact, getting scared over will-o-the-wisps. Like will-o-the-wisps, modest holdings by other financial institutions in banks are quite harmless and in fact, to be expected. We are hopeful he won't persuade a nervous House to get excited about it.

[From the Journal of Commerce, Jan. 7, 1967]

THE SKIRMISH LINE—MR. PATMAN SAYS WE ARE WRONG

To the Editor:

Your editorial of Jan. 4, 1967, attacking the study of commercial bank stock ownership and control recently published as a staff report by the Domestic Finance Subcommittee of the House Banking and Currency Committee was frankly amazing in its intemperate tone as well as its almost total disregard of the most important specific points made in the study.

You completely fail to point out, for example, the serious problem of banks holding in trust and voting large blocks of their own stock, a serious built-in conflict of interest. Seven states have by statute seen fit to protect the beneficiaries of trusts from this potential abuse by prohibiting trustees from voting their own shares.

In another state, Ohio, there is at this time a controversy over this very point.

However, most large banking states, such as New York, Illinois, Pennsylvania and California, provide no such protection, thus leaving thousands of people, who are almost totally at the mercy of the judgment of bank trustees, unprotected from this potential abuse. At least 198 of the 300 largest banks in the country hold some of their own shares, according to the report, and 63 of these banks exercise complete or partial control over the voting of 5 per cent or more of their own shares. If the study exposed no other problem, this problem of potential self-dealing alone would be enough to justify it.

But this is not the only serious problem uncovered by this study which your editorial chose to ignore. The report not only points out the extent to which funds managed by various types of financial institutions are invested in commercial bank stock, but also the extent to which these shares are voted by these institutions. The data on this point clearly support the conclusion that the heavy investment in and voting control over commercial bank stock by these institutions raises serious questions about the true level of competition among commercial banks and among financial institutions in general.

Let me also point out two misstatements of fact in your editorial. You state that "... what stocks banks hold for others and how they vote them are determined by the real owners of the securities. The banks are merely agents." This statement, as the study clearly points out, is not correct in a very large number of cases, and shows a complete lack of understanding of the powers of the trustee holding securities for the benefit of others. Voting control as well as investment powers often resides in the hands of bank trust departments. This is one of the major points brought out in the study, that control in many cases resides with the banks.

EXCLUDES HOLDING FIRMS

Another incorrect statement in your editorial is that the figures quoted in the study include the bank stock held by bank holding companies. Nowhere is this stated to be the case. In fact, if the data did include the bank stockholdings of bank holding companies, the figures would show an even greater degree of concentration of bank stockholdings in financial institutions. A quick check of the tables in the study would have shown that bank holding company

stockholdings were not included, as is evidenced, for example, by the very small number of shares shown for banks in the Marine Midland group.

There are other points in your editorial that might be disputed, but the truth of the matter is that most of the banking industry and those who serve it take the attitude that they should be exempt from all public scrutiny, should be free to do virtually anything that they want to do in order to serve their own interests, and should be completely free from the public interest investigations and regulations that other industries have been subjected to. A thoughtful critique of the specific points made in this report and other criticisms of the banking industry rather than an automatic defensive negative reaction to every criticism levelled at the banking industry would far better serve the public interest.

WRIGHT PATMAN,
Chairman, House Committee on
Banking and Currency.

EDITORS NOTE

(We have never argued that the banking industry and those who serve it should be exempt from all public scrutiny. We are glad to be corrected in our assumption that the Patman committee investigation included bank holding companies. We feel that Mr. Patman's own figures that only 63 of 198 large banks control voting of 5 per cent or more of their own shares indicates they realize there may be some conflict of interest. We still feel no substantial federal question is involved in the control of 5 per cent or thereabouts of their own bank stock by bank trust departments and that this is a matter for state laws or regulations. And we still feel that Mr. Patman and his committee are making a mountain out of a molehill.—ED.)

BIRTHDAY RECOGNITION FOR CONGRESSMAN ANNUNZIO

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, I want to apologize for being a bit tardy in recognizing the birthday of the gentleman from Illinois, the Honorable FRANK ANNUNZIO, who celebrated his 52d birthday last Thursday.

Congressman ANNUNZIO is one of the rising young Members of Congress and an important member of the Banking and Currency Committee.

Congressman ANNUNZIO was one of the leaders in the committee's investigation of loan sharks and sharp-practice operators in their dealings with servicemen. He has been hailed by a large number of veterans, civic, and industrial groups for his efforts in this field. He is a tireless worker and the 80-percent plurality by which he was returned to the 90th Congress indicates that he will be celebrating a number of birthdays in this body in the years to come.

NATIONAL SENIOR SERVICE CORPS

Mr. HICKS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Washington?

There was no objection.

Mr. HICKS. Mr. Speaker, I am happy to join with my distinguished colleagues, the gentleman from New York, Representative JONATHAN BINGHAM, and the gentleman from New Jersey, Representative PETER RODINO, in sponsoring legislation to create a National Community Senior Service Corps.

The need to encourage our senior citizens to participate more fully in our society is clear, for if they do not the loss is ours as well as theirs. The growth of our older population, and its increased percentage of our total population, are matters requiring immediate attention. We are faced with a double problem: How to accord to these men and women the dignity and comfort they deserve, and how to insure that their talents and rich experience are not lost to us because we isolate them from meaningful activity in our society.

The Senior Service Corps bears on both these problems. It would make possible the useful participation by senior citizens through the performance of needed community services, and would help to provide such services that would not otherwise be available. The bill I am introducing today would provide funds and technical assistance to nonprofit private organizations, municipalities, counties, and States to develop and implement programs meeting this dual purpose.

The programs would be administered by the State agency responsible for State plans for the elderly under the Older Americans Act of 1965, and close coordination will be required with Government agencies having duties in this area, such as the Department of Labor and the Office of Economic Opportunity. In this way previous experience relevant to the new programs can be brought to bear efficiently.

Under this legislation, programs would be required to be developed with the advice of competent specialists in the problems of the elderly, and would require the greatest possible participation by persons 60 and over in the planning and conduct of the programs.

The legislation would provide for short-term training necessary to utilize available skills in particular programs, but since the emphasis is upon the employment of existing skills, there will be no long-term job-training projects. Payment may be made for services, at the discretion of the local sponsoring agency, but, except in the most unusual circumstances, no individual would receive more than the maximum figure permitted under social security.

The bill would authorize an appropriation of \$9 million for the first fiscal year, and \$15 million for the second. It would authorize the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare to pay 100 percent of program costs during the first fiscal year, and 90 percent for the second year. The bill provides for a 2-year authorization.

Mr. Speaker, I believe this legislation is a promising new approach to the in-

creasing urgent problem of how to enrich the lives of our senior citizens, which would also add to the resources upon which we can call to meet the needs of our communities.

TO LOWER THE VOTING AGE

Mr. OLSEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Montana?

There was no objection.

Mr. OLSEN. Mr. Speaker, each year since I came to the Congress as Representative of Montana's First Congressional District I have supported legislation calling for a constitutional amendment to lower the voting age from 21 to 18. It is noteworthy, I believe, that enthusiasm for such an amendment has grown over the years among my colleagues and throughout the Nation.

Naturally I was pleased last week when my fellow Montanan, Senator MIKE MANSFIELD, introduced a joint resolution in the Senate to put to the States the question of lowering the voting age to 18. Today I introduced this measure in the House of Representatives and I ask that my colleagues in the House and the Senate give careful consideration and attention to this important proposal.

Educational psychologists have informed us that the ability to grasp new ideas reaches its peak at the age of 18. I believe this is significant in light of the fact that our educational system—the finest in history—is doing a remarkable job of producing well-informed graduates. Our high schools are succeeding in instilling in our young citizens an interest in their Government, and it is my conviction that we are discouraging this important, vibrant segment of our population if we continue to insist that young Americans remain on the sidelines for 3 years after many of them have reached the peak of interest and enthusiasm.

Such programs as VISTA and the Peace Corps have indicated the interest our young people have in public affairs and demonstrated their potential for valuable public service. I know many of my colleagues agree that our Nation would be strengthened if our young people are given an active role in selecting their representatives in government.

These points alone are, I think, dramatic support for the proposal to lower the voting age, but there is another basic consideration. Our young people become subject to the draft and compulsory military service at the age of 18. Certainly if our 18-year-old citizens are subject to governmental decisions which, in time of war, are matters of life and death for them, they deserve a voice in choosing the leaders responsible for making such important decisions.

The proposal I have introduced today requires the concurrence of two-thirds of the House and Senate and ratification by the legislatures of three-fourths of the several States within 7 years from the date of its submission to the States by the Congress.

INCREASING EDUCATIONAL OPPORTUNITIES THROUGHOUT THE NATION BY PROVIDING GRANTS FOR CONSTRUCTION OF ELEMENTARY AND SECONDARY SCHOOLS

Mr. PERKINS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the Record.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Kentucky?

There was no objection.

Mr. PERKINS. Mr. Speaker, I have today introduced a bill to increase educational opportunities throughout the Nation by providing grants for the construction of elementary and secondary schools and for supplemental educational centers. No greater need faces this Nation today than the need to assure all citizens appropriate opportunities to obtain the best possible education that technological developments and new teaching methods and techniques can provide. The 89th Congress made a great stride forward in legislation to authorize grants to local educational agencies to fund programs to strengthen educational opportunities, particularly on the elementary and preschool levels.

While I have been greatly disappointed that many of these programs have not been funded until late in the school years in 1965 and in 1966, the accomplishments to date forecast positive results in increasing educational achievement and progress in literally hundreds of thousands of classrooms throughout the Nation, as a direct result of the support being given schools under the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965—Public Law 89-10—as extended and amended under Public Law 89-750.

The funds provided under that act envision a wide variety of special educational programs devised by local school districts and a strengthening of existing educational programs to meet the special needs of schools impacted with disadvantaged children and children coming from low-income families. In too many instances the ability of local school districts to operate effective programs has been handicapped by the lack of appropriate facilities. The lack of facilities is most apparent in those areas least able to finance their construction. Thus in extensive hearings conducted by the General Subcommittee on Education during the 89th Congress, it was disclosed from a variety of sources that obsolete, dilapidated, hazardous, and overcrowded school facilities in the core of our Nation's cities and in hard-pressed, small rural and isolated communities dilute the effect that the special programs authorized under title I of ESEA would otherwise have had. Of course, in some instances the construction of facilities is authorized by title I of Public Law 89-10 as well as title III. However, situations are limited in which the urgent needs of educationally deprived children for program improvement will justify the use of title I funds for bricks and mortar.

Many of our school facilities today are themselves stark examples of poverty and it is difficult for the best education programs to meet the needs of disad-

vantaged children in a setting which is characteristic of poverty itself. If a real breakthrough is to be achieved in providing good educational opportunities in these needy areas of our Nation, it is essential that school facilities be up to date, safe, healthy, modern, and convey to children the importance with which our Nation regards the educational process and academic achievement. Little wonder to me that our dropout rates are high in low-income areas when we have placed so little value on the educational system as to house this most important activity so poorly.

Evidence submitted to our subcommittee during the 89th Congress indicated that there were approximately 28.8 million pupils or about three out of every four pupils attending school in buildings with two or more of the following gross deficiencies: First, structural defects; second, heat deficiencies; third, fire alarm deficiencies; fourth, stairway non-fire resistive; fifth, inadequate exits; sixth, no fire detection systems nor sprinklers; seventh, no electrical services; eighth, improper lighting.

Further evidence reveals that 5.5 million pupils or approximately one out of every eight are assigned to schools where the site and the buildings are not considered free of health, sanitation, fire safety, and structural deficiencies. Moreover, studies presented to our committee indicated that three out of every 10 pupils or 12.1 million are adversely affected by crowding of school facilities.

Mr. Speaker, the following charts disclose some of the findings of our subcommittee as to classroom construction needs:

TABLE 1.—Conditions of public school plants, 1964-65—Specific highlights

Totals, 50 States—		
	And District of Columbia	District of Columbia, and 4 outlying areas
1. million pupils attend schools where lighting is rated as partly satisfactory by local school officials.....	9,323	9,67
2. pupils attend schools where lighting is rated unsatisfactory.....	831,000	920,000
3. pupils are currently housed in school plants with combustible school buildings, constructed before 1928 and have reported structural, fire, and site deficiencies.....	448,000	461,000
4. percent of the pupil population does not have access to hot water at most handwashing lavatories.....	29.4	30.3
5. pupils are in buildings that have no electric service.....	10,000	64,000
6. million pupils attend schools which are unable to maintain temperatures in instructional rooms between 68° and 74° F., about one-half of these are in elementary school buildings.....	9,023	7,785
7. million pupils are in buildings in which the fire alarm system is not audible throughout the building.....	35,972	19,785
8. million pupils attend school in buildings without fire alarm systems (excludes 1-room schools).....	39,739	1,686

TABLE 1.—Conditions of public school plants, 1964-65—Specific highlights—Continued

Totals, 50 States—		
	And District of Columbia	District of Columbia, and 4 outlying areas
9. million pupils are in buildings with extensive structural deterioration.....	—	1,865
10. million pupils are in buildings with combustible stairways and stairwells.....	3,207	3,223
11. pupils occupy buildings with major infractions of local and/or State existing standards.....	361,000	474,000
12. percent of the pupils are housed in buildings without fire detection or sprinkler systems in high fire hazard areas.....	71.6	72.0
13. pupils are on school sites where water supply does not meet local or State health requirements.....	707,000	850,000
14. For pupils, toilets on the school site are located in outdoor privies.....	248,000	518,000
15. million pupils are attending school with 30 or more pupils per room.....	12,115	12,645
16. pupils attend school on sites which have no water piped into the buildings.....	133,000 4,100	183,000 4,600
17. school plants need science facilities.....	5,330	5,085
18. school plants need industrial, vocational, or technical shops.....	4,195	4,810

TABLE 3.—Additional pupil schoolrooms to eliminate certain deficiencies in school buildings for the 50 States, District of Columbia, and 4 outlying areas, 1964-65

[Number of additional rooms]				
Pupil-room ratios				
25 per elementary, 20 per secondary	Determined locally with local appraisal	27.4 per elementary, 27.5 per secondary, with U.S. median	30 per elementary, 30 per secondary	
To eliminate selected deficiencies.....	376,000	187,000	185,000	135,000
To eliminate off site.....	15,000	15,000	15,000	15,000
To eliminate nonpermanent.....	32,000	32,000	32,000	32,000
To eliminate improvised or makeshift.....	31,000	31,000	31,000	31,000
To achieve pupil-room ratio.....	298,000	109,000	107,000	57,000

Source: "Condition of Public School Plants, 1964-65," George J. Collins and William L. Storrer, Washington, D.C., U.S. Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, Office of Education, 1965.

TABLE 4.—School plants and pupils enrolled, by organizational level and pupil per room interval for 50 States, the District of Columbia, and 4 outlying areas, 1964-65

[Data for plants are rounded to nearest 100 and pupils are rounded to nearest 1,000]								
Number of plants								
Pupils per room ¹		Total ²		Elementary		Secondary		Combined
Plants	Pupils	Plants	Pupils	Plants	Pupils	Plants	Pupils	
Grand total ²	87,800	40,011,000	60,600	21,284,000	13,300	12,056,000	13,700	6,672,000
1 to 9.....	4,100	168,000	1,600	85,000	400	44,000	2,200	60,000
10 to 14.....	7,100	977,000	4,800	381,000	800	247,000	1,300	350,000
15 to 19.....	13,100	3,675,000	8,200	49,000	2,100	1,042,000	2,300	1,140,000
20 to 24.....	21,900	9,462,000	15,300	4,000	3,500	2,720,000	3,100	1,823,000
25 to 29.....	23,500	13,084,000	17,800	7,736,000	3,700	3,803,000	2,100	1,550,000
30 to 34.....	12,100	7,985,000	9,300	4,858,000	1,700	2,340,000	1,000	787,000
35 to 39.....	3,400	2,820,000	2,000	1,086,000	800	1,250,000	500	484,000
40 to 44.....	1,300	943,000	800	333,000	200	344,000	300	266,000
45 to 49.....	500	346,000	300	177,000	100	101,000	100	69,000
50 to 54.....	200	186,000	100	42,000	(2)	66,000	100	78,000
55 to 59.....	200	105,000	100	66,000	(2)	20,000	(2)	19,000
60 to 64.....	100	103,000	100	62,000	(2)	15,000	(2)	26,000
65 to 69.....	100	48,000	100	24,000	(2)	11,000	(2)	13,000
70 and over.....	100	109,000	100	49,000	(2)	52,000	(2)	8,000

¹ Pupils in nursery and kindergarten are counted as $\frac{1}{2}$ the total number reported in each plant to approximate the practice of providing $\frac{1}{2}$ -day instruction for these pupils.

² Columns may not add to exact totals because of varying inflation factors applied to individual school plants and because of rounding.

³ Less than 50.

TABLE 1.—Conditions of public school plants, 1964-65—Specific highlights—Continued

Totals, 50 States—		
	And District of Columbia	District of Columbia, and 4 outlying areas
19. additional classrooms would be needed to eliminate overcrowding.....	183,000	183,000
according to local school officials and to replace.....	107,000	109,000
make-shift, nonpermanent and offsite facilities.....	30,000	31,000
20. buildings have 4 or more defects.....	31,000	32,000
	15,000	15,000
	8,300	9,720

TABLE 2.—Additional instructional rooms needed in public school plants based on varying methods of pupil accommodation¹

Population area	25 elementary, 20 secondary	Median—27.6 elementary, 26.3 secondary	30 elementary, 30 secondary
Total.....	268,249	115,298	64,611
Urban.....	105,472	51,078	30,604
Suburban.....	79,010	30,177	15,340
Outside SMSA's.....	83,768	34,043	18,667

¹ Source of data: 92,006 individual school plant records in the National Inventory of School Facilities and Personnel, spring 1962 and updated in 35 States to spring 1964 by adding new school plants and eliminating abandoned school plants.

The following is a summary of the major provisions of H.R. 2365 which I have introduced today which is designed to take a step forward in meeting the pressing school construction needs of our Nation:

DISTRIBUTION OF FUNDS UNDER TITLE I

Title I of the bill would distribute funds to local public educational agencies on the basis of a formula similar to the formula contained in the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 as amended and extended by Public Law 89-750.

USES OF FUNDS TITLE I

A local educational agency could use funds granted pursuant to this title for the construction of school facilities of the local educational agency which are designed to serve school attendance areas having high concentration of children from low-income families including facilities for special projects conducted by the local educational agency in which children from such areas who are enrolled in nonpublic elementary or secondary schools may participate as authorized by title I of Public Law 89-10.

The State educational agency in approving applications by local public educational agencies for the use of funds under title I of the bill would follow basic criteria which would give priority for projects that provide for:

- (1) The replacement or restoration of hazardous or unsafe facilities;
- (2) Consolidation of school facilities;
- (3) The modernization or replacement of facilities which are antiquated or functionally obsolescent; and
- (4) The modernization or replacement of facilities to provide innovative facilities or equipment.

OTHER USES OF FUNDS UNDER TITLE I

In those local school districts where a maximum effort is being made by the local public educational agency to provide broadened educational opportunities for children in school attendance areas where there are concentrations of educationally deprived children, the local public educational agency could use construction grants provided by title I for the construction of any needed school facility in the district.

Such maximum effort must be evidenced by—

- (1) The local educational agency is making a reasonable tax effort and is exercising due diligence in availing itself of state and other financial assistance and
- (2) The facilities in the school district for carrying out the provisions of section 205 of Public Law 89-10 relating to education programs for educationally deprived children, are adequate and appropriate.

These determinations are to be made by the State educational agency under broad criteria prescribed by the Commissioner of the U.S. Office of Education. The State educational agency also makes the determination with respect to the need for the construction of a facility other than one to carry out the program authorized by section 205 of Public Law 89-10 in the event that the local education agency qualifies for this special use of funds granted pursuant to title I of the bill.

DISTRIBUTION OF FUNDS FOR CONSTRUCTION UNDER TITLE II

Title II of the bill would amend section 301 of title III of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 by adding additional authorizations for the purpose of constructing facilities to house programs authorized by title III of such act.

Authorizations for construction grants for this purpose would be as follows:

[In millions]

Fiscal year:	Amount of grant
1967	\$250
1968	500
1969	500
1970	500
1971	500

In addition, authorizations for regular program operation under title III of Public Law 89-10 would be as follows:

[In millions]

Fiscal year:	Amount of grant
1967	\$150
1968	200
1969	250
1970	300

GENERAL PROVISIONS

The language under title I of the bill would become a permanent title II of Public Law 815 of the 81st Congress, title I of which upon the enactment of H.R. 9948 would deal with school construction in areas affected by Federal activities and title II would deal with school construction in areas where there are concentrations of educationally deprived children.

BAD PRECEDENT IN POWELL CASE

Mr. PATTEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New Jersey?

There was no objection.

Mr. PATTEN. Mr. Speaker, I am very pleased to call attention to a couple of editorials which have recently appeared in two distinguished newspapers in the State of New Jersey—namely, the Daily Home News of New Brunswick, N.J., on Thursday, January 12, 1967, and the Newark Evening News of Newark, N.J., on Wednesday, January 11, 1967.

[From the Daily Home News, New Brunswick (N.J.), Jan. 12, 1967]

BAD PRECEDENT IN POWELL CASE

"Each House shall be the judge of the elections, returns and qualifications of its own members. . . .

"Each House may determine the rules of its proceedings, punish its members for disorderly behavior, and, with a concurrence of two-thirds, expel a member."

These are quotations from the Constitution of the United States which should be considered with regard to the Adam Clayton Powell case.

The first quotation rather clearly refers directly to the seating of members, and it seems to be directed solely to the fact of election and to the meeting of qualifications presumably those set by the Constitution with regard to age, citizenship and residence. It does not appear to authorize the members of a legislative house to go beyond those facts.

The second quotation refers to a house's punishment of its members, even to expulsion.

Neither quotation seems to bulwark the House majority which has refused to seat Adam Clayton Powell, pending a committee investigation. He is not a member of the House until he is seated, and thus does not appear now subject to House punishment.

What the House seems to have done is to refuse to Powell the protection of the traditional presumption of innocence until guilt is proved. He is not being permitted to represent his constituents until a House

group probes his actions. No proof has been adduced in the House.

A proper procedure would have been to seat Powell, who has met the constitutional requirements of election and qualifications, and then, if it be the House's will, proceed to investigate him and expel him by the two-thirds vote if reason for expulsion is found.

We bear no brief for Powell. We do not believe he is being persecuted for his color's sake. We think his attacks on Congress this week have been intemperate to the point of slander.

But our disappointment at the mess Powell is making of his promising congressional life, our sense of outrage at his defiance of the law, should not lead us to set a dangerous unconstitutional precedent and bar from House membership, if only for a day, a man legally elected to represent a constituency.

[From the Newark Evening News, Jan. 11, 1967]

MR. POWELL'S FALL

Adam Clayton Powell, by his irregular conduct, had disqualified himself for the chairmanship of the House Education and Labor Committee, and the Democratic caucus was on sound ground in removing him. Going his freewheeling way, Mr. Powell had offered little in defense except his race.

Now Mr. Powell finds himself in deeper trouble. He has been denied a seat by the House membership, pending outcome of an investigation which presumably will range over the full course of his affairs. Here, however, the House seems on less solid ground, even though it holds the constitutional power to judge the qualifications of its members. Instead of affording Mr. Powell fresh opportunity to cry prejudice, as he did so arrogantly immediately after the vote, the House, without further damage to its reputation, could have seated him to represent his constituency while the inquiry proceeded.

Yet his impatient colleagues are in part responsible for Mr. Powell's troubles. Congress has consistently refused to adopt standards necessary to prevent abuses of public trust, conflicts of interest and otherwise to police the ethical conduct of its members. Neither house can satisfy its honor by prosecuting only conspicuous cases.

THE KENNEDY DREAM

Mr. PATTEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New Jersey?

There was no objection.

Mr. PATTEN. Mr. Speaker, Miss Isabel M. Brylawski, of the Home News, of New Brunswick, N.J., wrote me:

It (a letter-to-the-editor by Stephen G. Callas on the late President John F. Kennedy) expresses what is the opinion of many people in the United States and all over the world and deserves insertion in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. It is a moving and beautiful tribute to one of our greatest Presidents, the late and beloved John F. Kennedy.

The writer of the article, Stephen G. Callas, of Edison, N.J., is my legislative assistant in Washington and was office manager of Middlesex County, N.J., Citizens for Kennedy-Johnson in 1960, when the county produced a plurality of 32,000 for those two outstanding and victorious candidates.

Mr. Callas' article, which was entitled "The Kennedy Dream" by the Home News, and written on November 30, 1966, is hereby inserted in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD:

THE KENNEDY DREAM

"The dreamer dies," wrote Burnet, "but never dies the dream."

John F. Kennedy's dream did not perish. It lives on. It was not an impractical dream, for Kennedy, though an idealist, was also a pragmatist. And dreams should not be disparaged, for often the dreams of the past become the programs of the present and future.

He envisioned, "... a new world of law where the strong are just and the weak secure and the peace preserved."

That was the goal he sedulously worked for, and although he did not live long enough to reach it, he brought it closer to realization.

The courage and judgment of John F. Kennedy during the Cuban missile crisis helped produce "one of the great turning points in history," Harold Macmillan told the House of Commons. This one act alone may have saved millions of lives.

To the millions who mourn John Kennedy, there are at least two consolations:

—In those brief but memorable years he gave America and the world a new hope, which Robert F. Kennedy told West Berliners, remains "a living force."

—The work that John Kennedy left unfinished may be completed by his brother Robert, who may lead the nation some day.

There was once a tribute to the assassinated president, which ended with these thoughtful words of solace: "... for what is remembered is never lost."

John F. Kennedy left much to be remembered—more than anything else, his unlimited promise. That is why those who loved him in life, love him even more in death, for only now do they fully appreciate him—for what he was, what he represented, and what he might have achieved if he had served for eight years.

What beautiful memories he left with us.

Perhaps never again with the United States have a president who had "everything"—the brilliant mind, the engaging personality, the brave and compassionate heart, the vigorous leadership, the handsome appearance, the lovely family, these and more.

The years will pass and some memories will dim, but to many Americans, John Fitzgerald Kennedy will forever be remembered as young and eloquent and smiling—and, above all, unconquerable.

His moving words, notable deeds and inspiring ideals will arouse this and future generations—to hope and work and fight—until his dream of "... a new world ..." comes true.

And because dreams and hopes help sustain us in the battles we face in life and death, Burnet's words can help give us the strength and faith needed to prevail:

"Still shall the vision live! Say nevermore That dreams are fragile things. What else endures

Of all this broken world save only dreams!"

STEPHEN G. CALLAS.

EDISON.

THE DOW REPORT

Mr. DOW. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. DOW. Mr. Speaker, a number of times during the recent campaign in my district we debated aspects of the U.S. involvement in Vietnam. While I tried on several occasions to summarize my views on this difficult subject, due to the heat of the campaign and the complexity of the problem no such statement was ever put out.

However, it seems to me that the man in the street in my district wants to know in an overall way the position of his Congressman on the critical issue of Vietnam. This is all the more so because this particular Congressman believes that the policy of our country is a mistaken one and that we should take measures to reduce our part in the conflict. Accordingly I submit as an extension of my remarks, the summary of my views that is being sent to all papers and news media in my congressional district at this time.

I do not mean to imply that a summary completes the case in all particulars. Much more of detail could be filled in. I merely contain herein remarks which were sent to the press:

THE DOW REPORT

Many times in newspapers and on radio, I have discussed Vietnam for I take it very seriously. This statement to you is as important as anything I have said or done since being in Congress.

Vietnam is becoming more critical to us all the time. A crossroad may soon be reached where our nation will face a decision of the gravest sort—whether to expand the conflict or reduce it.

To me, the one bright spot in America's involvement is the courage and devotion of our fighting men. All the rest of it seems to me a colossal mistake, that Americans, fine as they are, have difficulty in admitting. In order to judge about Vietnam you do not need to know bookfuls of facts. All you need in order to understand the problem in Vietnam is some knowledge of the situation over there as given over and over again in the press, some common sense, and a sense of morality.

AGGRESSION EXAGGERATED

The infiltration of Vietnamese from the North zone of Vietnam to the South zone was used by the United States in 1965 as a reason for increasing our military actions in Vietnam. We called the infiltration "aggression," although all the infiltrators were Vietnamese and a high proportion were originally South Vietnamese. And all this movement was happening inside Vietnam, not outside.

Unlike Pearl Harbor, this movement of Vietnamese was not a very obvious "aggression." Our State Department published a book to "prove" that it was "aggression." Without a book to explain, the world evidently didn't see it as "aggression."

I would like to know how the nations can get along safely in the nuclear age, if one nation such as the United States decides on its own to punish another people for something which does not suit it? This is even more serious when we punish these people for actions inside their own country. And it is more serious still when the "aggression" we object to was not directed against us.

These are the regrettable circumstances of Vietnam.

In addition, a good deal is said in order to link Red China with "aggression." Yet it must be stated that Red China today has no troops fighting outside her own borders. I do not care for Red China, but I also think this whole problem is so important that we must look at it accurately.

A further justification for American involvement has been offered because the Viet Cong are so cruel. No doubt they are, and do torture civilians. However, our side is hard put to point a finger at this as long as innocent civilians are being burned by the jellied gasoline and white phosphorous that is dropped from American planes. When I see pictures of little children burned and without limbs, I wonder how long our nation wants to continue this warfare of which the rightness is seriously questioned. This does not add any lustre to the American heritage.

FEAR OF RED CHINA

For the United States to fear that Red China will overwhelm small countries in Southeast Asia, like Vietnam, shows that we have a kind of unhealthy belief in Communism. All nations in the world today are nationalistic. Even if they accept Communist doctrine they are unlikely to knuckle under to China. Moreover, Communist enemies could not strike our shores any quicker if they were entrenched in Southeast Asia than they could right today from many missile bases.

Our actions in Vietnam are not preventing alien ideology from arising in South America, Africa, or elsewhere. As a matter of fact, by fighting in Vietnam, we are not stamping out Communism at the roots in Peking and Moscow. I do not advocate war on Peking or Moscow. I just regret that fellow Americans are making terrible sacrifices in Vietnam for so little gain.

RISK TO WORLD PEACE

The United States' exaggeration of aggression in Vietnam is all the more to be regretted because it is a threat to world peace. Peace was never so important as today, when any small incident could trip off the destruction of the world.

For example, there might be an accidental dropping of bombs on China by American planes; or the sinking of a Russian freighter in a harbor of North Vietnam; or possibly an effort by China to oust American warships from Hong Kong harbor. Any of these occurrences could set the world aflame.

Is it right for the United States to allow this risk in our world? All nations are deeply alarmed about the danger in Vietnam to world peace. Pope Paul has prayed for no more war. Mr. U Thant, Secretary General of the United Nations, has asked us to stop the bombing. The Prime Ministers of England and India and the President of France have spoken in like terms. Nowhere does any great leader of another nation support the United States' action.

It is all right to respect our own leadership, but we owe it to other people to listen also to their leaders. Remember, they have no democratic voice in the decisions about Vietnam. Even though we may be acting as a world policeman, the other nations have not selected us for that role. Their existence is threatened by errors which United States forces may make—and clearly it troubles those nations.

OUR COMMITMENT TO ALL

It seems to me that the very first commitment the United States has is to work for peace in this world of three billion human beings. This tremendous commitment to the world comes far ahead of any commitment in Vietnam.

There are some who say we are fighting in Vietnam for freedom. But we can fight for freedom best in our own back yard by helping our many Negro and white brethren in this country who have neither political, economic, or social freedom. You will find people without these freedoms in nearly every American community. I can show you some in our own district, in your own community. To our own fellow Americans we owe more than any commitment in South Vietnam.

VIETNAMESE WANT PEACE

It is beginning to appear that even the Vietnamese want peace rather than "freedom" as we speak of it. The South Vietnamese army is twice the size of their opponent's and better armed.

Our South Vietnamese government has hardly shown that it deserves the special sacrifice of Americans. The South Vietnamese government feuds within itself. Its promise of land reform has not been kept. Well-fixed Vietnamese stay in Paris while American boys fight for them in Vietnam. Black markets thrive in Saigon on goods pilfered from American shipments. And so it goes. The picture among South Vietnamese is scarcely one of universal dedication and sacrifice. I think this is basically because the present South Vietnamese government is not one that commands their respect. It is their responsibility to work out their own problems. That is not our commitment.

OUR OBLIGATION

We have an immense obligation to our own men in Vietnam for they are serving in a spirit of dedication and sacrifice. Most importantly we owe it to them to provide statesmanship that is wise. Let us keep them out of the jungles of Asia as General MacArthur warned us to do. We should not send them into combat against other men who are dedicated fighters for a cause of reform. That dedication has been shown by the enemy, the Viet Cong, whether we believe their idea of reform is good or not.

We should not send our men 8,200 miles from home to the edge of a hostile continent, where there is no ocean or span of water to give them the strategic advantage. We have allowed our opponent to choose the battleground.

Finally, it is claimed that we owe our men in Vietnam a victory, a win. This is said even though our actions in Vietnam may cause the world as we know it to go up in flames. When we talk about a "win," let us remember that the situation in Vietnam is not an athletic contest. It is an immense problem of great social and political complexity that is unlikely to yield to such a nice, trim ending.

Even though, after years of effort and expenditure of more thousands of our men, the United States manages to occupy some major part of Vietnam, can we ever go away and leave it—or leave a puppet Vietnamese government there? As soon as we do, those guerrillas will come back again.

In fact, it's my belief that there can be no peace for us, and none for the world, as long as we keep our forces in Vietnam. They are too much a thorn in the side of Asia. Only recently the British, French, and Dutch empires have been expelled from Asia. A number of United States bases still form a ring around China and eastern Asia. Our American effort to set up another base in Vietnam on the mainland, is an invitation to never-ending warfare. In order to help ourselves in Vietnam we're now building a second base in Thailand. Asiatics will give us no peace whatsoever as long as we stay in those bases.

COST OF THE CONFLICT

We must not count the cost of warfare when defense of our country is at stake. The appalling cost must certainly be counted, however, in a case like Vietnam where we have so little reason to be there. That cost is believed close to two billion dollars a month. It is certainly a principal reason for the high prices noted when we go to the supermarket. War always raises prices.

One newspaper has divided the cost of our operations in Vietnam by the number of Viet Cong who have been slain. According to this it costs \$332,000 to kill one Viet Cong. That is enough to send 30 young men and women to college.

WHAT IS THE SOLUTION?

I believe the solution for us in Vietnam is a clear-cut decision, like the cutting of the Gordian Knot by Alexander of Macedonia. Since an expansion of the hostilities has so little to commend it, the best advice would be to begin reducing our military activity in Vietnam. This would mean an end to bombing. Then we should schedule a withdrawal. No doubt it would take time. Such time could be employed to encourage negotiation.

Our Generals Gavin and Ridgway have advised us to pull back to set positions along the coast. This would be a good beginning of an end to the war. After that we should, it seems to me, plan a complete withdrawal on our own initiative, regardless of whether this, that, or the other group is willing to negotiate.

It is rather weak of us to stake peace, as we do, on the answers of the North Vietnamese leader, Ho Chi Minh, to the many peace suggestions that have been showered upon him. When we put such decisions up to Ho Chi Minh we are really leaving world peace, and even our destiny as a nation, in his hands.

Let us make our own American decision to be done with that fruitless, needless, and dangerous conflict.

LOWERING THE LEGAL VOTING AGE TO 18

Mr. HECHLER of West Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from West Virginia?

There was no objection.

Mr. HECHLER of West Virginia. Mr. Speaker, there has been increased sentiment over the past year or two toward lowering the voting age to 18. Along with a number of my House and Senate colleagues, I have introduced a joint resolution for a constitutional amendment to lower the voting age to 18. I noted with great interest that both the majority and the minority leaders of the other body have introduced similar resolutions, which have received considerable public support throughout the Nation and also in the legislatures of the various States. I believe the fact that we have so many young men between the ages of 18 and 21 who are fighting in Vietnam gives added emphasis to the need for lowering the voting age.

I would also point out that when the voting age was first set at 21 in the early years of our Republic, our educational system was far inferior to what it is now. Young men and young women at the age of 18 are far better educated today than they were in the early years of our Republic when the voting age was set at 21. As we all know, the States of Georgia and Kentucky now allow 18-year-olds to vote, and two other States, Alaska and Hawaii, have set the voting age below 21. I would urge my colleagues to give support to a constitutional amendment lowering the voting age to 18.

In the near future, I will ask for a special order to elaborate on the many reasons why we should now proceed toward adoption of such an amendment to the Constitution.

PROPOSAL TO EXCLUDE FROM INCOME CERTAIN REIMBURSED MOVING EXPENSES

Mr. BURKE of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mr. BURKE of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I introduced on January 10, 1967, H.R. 47, a bill to exclude from income certain reimbursed moving expenses. This bill is identical to H.R. 13070 which I introduced in the 89th Congress. As you know, there were 148 bills of a similar nature introduced in the House, including 19 by other members of the Committee on Ways and Means. Moreover, eight members of the Senate Committee on Finance joined with 16 other Senators in the sponsoring of a similar Senate measure. I am confident, Mr. Speaker, that support for this measure has grown in the past year and that H.R. 47 should and will be enacted this year.

For a number of years confusion has existed with respect to the treatment for income tax purposes of moving expenses reimbursed to employees. The prevailing practice, until the IRS announced its present position in 1965 (Rev. Rul. 65-158, C.B. 1965-1, 34), had always been to exclude reimbursed moving expenses from income of the employee.

The uncertainty began when the IRS issued a rule in 1954 (Rev. Rul. 54-429, C.B. 1954-2, 53), permitting employees to exclude reimbursed "moving" expenses from income, without defining such expenses. After a number of years it became apparent that employers and the IRS were defining "moving" expenses differently. To employers this term included all reasonable out-of-pocket expenses incurred by the employee in moving since the purpose of reimbursement was to make the employee whole. Anything less than full reimbursement of moving expenses would be a deterrent to acceptance by employees of changes in assignment requiring relocation. The free mobility of employees is essential in modern business.

On the other hand, "moving" expenses were finally defined by the IRS in Rev. Rul. 65-158, after years of inaction in clarifying its position, to mean only the direct costs of transporting a person, his family and personal property from one location to the other. This interpretation, which is highly unrealistic, most likely was strongly influenced by the then existing rule applicable to civil service employees which permitted the Government to reimburse only the direct costs of transportation, which rule, of course, was made obsolete by Public Law 89-516.

Over the years there has been considerable litigation. When the Supreme Court denied a petition for certiorari in January 1966, in the England case (382 U.S. 986), upholding the position of the IRS, it was believed that this might

dispose of the issue so far as litigation was concerned. However, now that the Starr case (46 TC —, No. 78, Sept. 26, 1966), has been decided by the Tax Court in favor of the taxpayer, substantially accepting the view that reimbursement of reasonable out-of-pocket expenses incurred in moving were excludable from income, the uncertainty has been raised anew. The uncertainty will likely continue until the court of appeal of two circuits are in conflict at which time the U.S. Supreme Court would no doubt hear the case on the merits and finally resolve the issue. This process, however, will take many years.

In these circumstances, legislation is clearly the best course for quick clarification of the existing uncertainty. As I have already indicated, legislation was attempted during the previous Congress. There was much congressional support, particularly since the Civil Service Commission requested and Congress passed legislation—Public Law 89-516—granting reimbursement to Government employees for moving expenses over and above the direct costs of transportation. It was made clear by the Chairman of the Civil Service Commission that taxing the employee on the additional reimbursement nullified, to the extent of his tax liability, the objective of the reimbursement.

The principal opposition to clarifying legislation comes from the Treasury Department and its objection is not based on the merits but, primarily, on the revenue loss involved. The revenue loss is hardly an adequate basis for objection since the Government's right to the revenue has not been finally established in litigation.

Further, I am well aware of the necessity for minimizing tax revenue loss but I am equally well aware of the necessity for maintaining taxpayer confidence in the operation of our self-assessment system. Most of us, I am convinced, believe that existing law represents an attempt to tax something that is not really income. The attitude of harassment that these employee-taxpayers derive from present enforcement endeavors seriously jeopardizes the voluntary aspects on which our entire self-assessment system is founded. The tax revenue loss involved in this bill is a loss of tax revenue to which the Treasury has no right in equity or commonsense.

Each year of delay in solving this problem creates mounting inequity if litigation ultimately favors the taxpayer. As I have already pointed out, it is essential to business that employees be reimbursed their moving expenses. Since the IRS is now adamant in its position that such reimbursements over and above the direct costs of transportation constitute taxable income, the employers in most cases have increased the amount of the moving expense reimbursement to include the income tax on the reimbursement in order to make the employee financially whole. This, of course, is a cost of the employer. If the courts ultimately hold that reimbursed moving expenses are excludable from income of the employee, it is not likely that very many employees will exercise the right to recover tax for past years since they already have been made

whole and any refund would have to be returned to the employer or included in the taxable income of the employee. Thus, the Treasury Department will have received a windfall because the employer, the one who has absorbed the cost, has no standing to claim a refund. The question of revenue loss, since the Government may yet be ruled by the courts not to be entitled to the tax it claims, should not influence the desirability of legislative action.

I feel it is unconscionable that this sort of uncertainty and increasing inequity should be allowed to continue. I hope the Congress will recognize its responsibility in this matter and legislate the governing rules.

SUMMARY OF PROVISIONS OF H.R. 47

Under present law, expenses of moving the employee, his family and household goods to the new place of work are clearly nontaxable.

This bill would also make nontaxable the following reimbursed expenses:

First, House-hunting trip of employee and spouse when both the old and the new job locations are located within the United States.

Second, Temporary living expenses at the new employment location while awaiting occupancy of permanent quarters. Reimbursement here cannot exceed a period of 30 days except that the period is extended to 60 days when a taxpayer is moved from or to a foreign country such as Puerto Rico, the Canal Zone, or one of the possessions of the United States.

Third, Selling commissions and other residence or to the settlement of an unexpired lease on the employee's old residence.

Fourth, Out-of-pocket expenses incident to the purchase of a residence at the new job location.

Fifth, Other miscellaneous expenses directly attributable to the transfer but not to exceed the lesser of 2 weeks' pay or \$1,000 in the case of a family man or the lesser of 1 week's pay or \$500 in the case of a single employee.

The benefits of the special exclusion for employees who were reimbursed for the above items are limited under the bill to those employees who have worked for the same or a related employer for at least 1 year at the time of the transfer.

THE LINDBERGH KIDNAPING ACT

Mr. HUTCHINSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. HUTCHINSON. Mr. Speaker, news reports late last week included the decision of a Federal district judge holding the Lindbergh Kidnaping Act unconstitutional. The Lindbergh Act prescribes the death penalty, but only if the verdict of the jury so recommends. The judge sees in this proviso somehow a limitation on the constitutional right to trial by jury. If a defendant pleads guilty, the judge reasons, the death sentence cannot be imposed against him,

because there has been no jury to recommend it. Thus, according to the judge, the exercise of his right to trial by jury subjects him to the possibility of greater punishment than if a jury trial is waived.

The Lindbergh Act has stood as the law of the land for 35 years. It is a necessary weapon in combating crime against the safety of persons. Congress should not tolerate any loss of the act's effectiveness under a cloud of unconstitutionality.

I am today introducing a bill to remove the jury proviso in the Lindbergh law. As amended, the act would permit the court to impose the death sentence or life imprisonment if the kidnaped person is not released unharmed, or to impose life imprisonment or for a term of years if the person is released without harm.

The Congress should act with all deliberate speed to plug up the loopholes which the courts bore in our criminal law.

CONGRESSMAN HORTON SUBMITS PLAN FOR EASING TENSIONS IN MIDDLE EAST

Mr. HORTON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. HORTON. Mr. Speaker, we have all noted with a great deal of concern the buildup of tensions in the Middle East over the last few months. As I address you today, increasing numbers of Syrian and Israel troops face each other across the U.N. armistice line near the Sea of Galilee.

We cannot wait until the day that bullets replace the blistering charges and countercharges which have been regularly exchanged across the frontiers. It is time that our Nation took affirmative action to soften the tensions in this area. Just yesterday, U Thant, Secretary-General of the United Nations, urged a meeting between Israel and Syrian officials as a first step toward reducing military clashes. Today, Israel expressed its agreement to such a meeting, but the latest statements from Damascus appear to add up to a rejection of U Thant's plea. The solution to the present crisis, and prevention of a large-scale war in the Middle East cannot be allowed to depend on the whim of Arab militance. There is far too much at stake for the rest of the world's people to sit idly by waiting for the nations of that area to work out their own problems, by whatever means they are driven to use.

Thus, Mr. Speaker, I have today proposed that the United States through its delegation at the United Nations, should take immediate steps toward agreement on a joint guarantee of present Middle Eastern frontiers by our country and the Soviet Union. By stating clearly that neither America nor Russia will tolerate the creation of another "hot spot" over Arab-Israel bound-

aries, will be serving notice on the aggressors that there is nothing to be gained from continued attack or harassment.

Last August, I went to the Middle East as a representative of this House to the dedication of the new Israel Capitol Building. At that time, I visited the border area where current clashes are occurring. I can tell my colleagues from firsthand conversations that the people on the Israel side of the border live in constant fear for their security from Syrian guerrilla attacks. Israel is a nation which is constantly on the alert; her men and women stand guard in watchtowers which dot the border. Since Israel gained her independence in 1948, U.N. truce teams and military patrols have been an ever-present fact of life. As Arab attacks continue, the pressure on Israel policymakers to retaliate reaches a point beyond the realm of measured restraint.

It is important that we not allow Israel to be pushed into a war of face-saving or a war to defend her territory against intermittent slaughter. One way we can ease this pressure is to put world opinion squarely behind maintaining the territorial status quo in the Middle East. A frontier guarantee agreement between the United States and Russia would have this effect; but we must act quickly if we are to succeed. I hope my colleagues will take prompt and favorable action on the measure I have submitted today, as a demonstration of the desire of the American people to prevent an armed flareup in the Middle East.

CONGRESSMAN HORTON SUBMITS PROPOSAL TO EXCLUDE MOVING- EXPENSE REIMBURSEMENTS FROM TAXABLE INCOME

Mr. HORTON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the *RECORD* and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. HORTON. Mr. Speaker, last year, we enacted a provision of law which allows the Federal Government to reimburse its employees for certain expenses incurred in moving as a result of a Government requested transfer. Our passage of that law is important because it encourages mobility in the American labor force.

Private industry has recognized the importance of mobility for many years, and most firms have liberal moving-expense reimbursement policies. The bill we enacted last year brought Federal policies up to date by adding many items to the list of reimbursable moving expenses. Prior to this law, house-hunting trips, temporary living costs, costs of selling one home and buying another, and certain other miscellaneous expenses were not considered reimbursable by the Government. Now a Federal employee, like his counterparts in private industry, stands to lose far less when he transfers from one job to another at his employer's request.

But the enactment of H.R. 10607 last year did not complete the job of updating Federal law on this subject. There remains the very important question of tax treatment of these reimbursement payments. While we have broadened the concept of what expenses should be reimbursed, the state of income tax law on this subject lags far behind. Only the actual costs of travel to the new home and shipment of household effects have been exempt from taxation under present law. Thus, reimbursements for other moving-expense items which are now paid by the Federal Government as well as by private industry are treated as taxable income to the employee.

This tax policy has serious effects on the reimbursement practice which has grown up in the past few decades. First of all, the reimbursement for expenses, when taxed, does not fully cover the paid-out costs to the employee of moving from one place to another, as his employer intends it to. Second, the employer is forced to treat the payment as taxable, and thus withhold the appropriate tax from the employee. Thus, the tax law works against the principle of full-expense reimbursement which we adopted for the Federal Government last year.

In a recent case where the taxpayer sought to test this tax policy before the Supreme Court, the Attorney General argued that Congress, and not the Court should decide this issue. A hearing before the Court was denied on these grounds. Thus, Mr. Speaker, I have introduced again in the 90th Congress a bill that would exclude from gross taxable income reimbursements for certain costs of moving, in keeping with the premise that we in Congress must take the responsibility for updating this law.

For two reasons: First that it is manifestly inconsistent for the Government to recognize the legitimacy of these expenses for reimbursement on the one hand, while taxing these employer payments as income on the other; and second, that it is not proper policy for the Government to impose a drag on the necessary mobility of our society and economy, I urge my colleagues to consider closely the need for prompt passage of this legislation.

THE LATE HENRY F. SCHRICKER

Mr. ARENDS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. BRAY] may extend his remarks at this point in the *RECORD* and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. BRAY. Mr. Speaker, in Indiana's long history of great political leaders, few men have made such a mark, and few have left such a fine heritage, than did former Gov. Henry F. Schricker. The State of Indiana mourns the passing of one of her noblest sons.

The respect and admiration accorded to this man was not limited by party or class. He was known and looked up to throughout the State as one whose life was an enduring symbol of good government.

America needs more men in public life like Henry Schricker, and his service and devotion to his State and his country will never be forgotten.

[From the Ellettsville (Ind.) Journal, Jan. 4, 1967]

ELLETTSVILLE COMMUNITY LOSES A LOYAL AND LONGTIME FRIEND

Former Governor Henry F. Schricker, who died last Wednesday, was a loyal friend of the Ellettsville community throughout the years and he will always be remembered here for his many contributions for the betterment of this community as well as the advancement of the Hoosier state and the nation.

Henry F. Schricker, who became a legend in his own life time, had become a vital part of this community and the annual Monroe County Fall Festival.

He made his first official visit here in 1937 at Ellettsville's Centennial celebration which was held in connection with the third annual Fall Festival. This was his first year as lieutenant-governor. He was impressed by the Festival and by Ellettsville and its people, and Ellettsville and its people were impressed by him. Since that first visit in 1937 he never missed a Fall Festival, and in the years that the Festival was not held, he attended a Festival-sponsored or community-sponsored event each year.

His visit here in 1966 was his twenty-ninth annual. He drove his own car a distance of 180 miles from Knox last fall to crown the Fall Festival Queen and to participate in a number of programs that marked the sesquicentennial year of the State of Indiana. The Edgewood High School Library was named the Henry F. Schricker Library and dedicated in his honor during the 1966 Festival. The beloved elder statesman spoke on the opening night program of the Festival and addressed an all-school convocation in connection with the library dedication ceremonies, and both addresses were considered masterpieces.

During the past twenty-nine years the former Governor had made a hundred speeches in the Ellettsville community. He spoke here during World War II at the dedication of Memorial Park and at the Victory Service following the end of World War II; he participated in the dedication of the Edgewood High School building in May, 1965 and at the dedication of Ellettsville's new fire station in the fall of 1964. He also spoke here at a number of union church services.

Many of these trips were made when he really was not physically able to come or when he had other commitments; but still he came.

Aside from the Festival, Henry F. Schricker supported this community in various ways. He was a strong supporter of the Richland-Bean Blossom School District, and he contributed to the new fire station and boosted various community projects.

He had worshipped in our churches and visited with our people and was truly loved by the citizens of this community.

Henry F. Schricker, by official action of the Town Council, was an adopted citizen of Ellettsville and in 1949 was elected honorary president of the Monroe County Fall Festival Association.

We could go on and on telling of his many good deeds and contributions to this community, but we think a statement of a young gas attendant made Friday night as some of our people were preparing to leave for Knox for the funeral sums up the feeling this community had for Henry F. Schricker. This young man said, "I know where you're going—you're going to the funeral of the man who was everybody's friend."

Yes, Henry F. Schricker was everybody's friend—the great, the near great, and the lowly. He has been lauded by many as the state's greatest governor and Indiana's first citizen. We believe history will prove these statements true. He was not only the only

man in Hoosier history to be elected Governor of Indiana twice, but, his record was also one of accomplishment, thrift, and honesty in government. Henry F. Schricker was a great man because he was always close to the people. He had the common touch, and he was a Christian gentleman in all his dealings.

His contributions to this community, to the state, and to the nation were great, and his memory will live on in the hearts of thousands here and throughout the Hoosier state he loved so much and served so well.

[From the Martinsville (Ind.) Daily Reporter, Dec. 29, 1966]

AN HONEST MAN

Perhaps the most perceptive tribute to Henry F. Schricker, was made by former Governor Ralph F. Gates. Gates said of Schricker: "He never let politics interfere with doing what he thought was the right thing for the state of Indiana."

We don't know what else to say about the late distinguished governor that could throw more light on his career, except to note that he was a politician whose primary reputation was for honesty; and that's not a reputation that's easy to come by nowadays.

[From the Lebanon (Ind.) Reporter, Dec. 29, 1966]

HENRY F. SCHRICKER

Henry Schricker was a man of many talents who leaned heavily on common sense during his eight years as Indiana's Chief Executive.

He was a good listener . . . willing to hear the views of others and give them careful consideration. But when he made up his mind on the course he felt would do the most good for the most people, he acted with finality. "The voters put me in this high office, but I am beholden to no politician, for my duty is to represent all the people," he once told me.

He well could go down in history as Indiana's greatest non-partisan Governor. He liked people, and people liked him. You couldn't help but respect his executive ability, honesty, sense of fair play and sense of humor.

Our paths crossed frequently on the banquet trail. Near the end of his second term he was trying to make up his mind whether to return to the banking business, go into insurance or retire to his Knox home "just to catch up on Maude's (his wife) sensible cooking."

After participating in three dinner meetings within a week, we were comparing notes. At French Lick I noticed he passed up the vegetables on his plate. "I hope I never see another green pea as long as I live," he said.

We had a controversial squirrel law in Indiana and when Mr. Schricker was running for the State Legislature he closed one of his speeches with: "Now, does anyone have a question?"

One fellow in the crowd yelled out: "Yeah, Henry, how do you stand on the squirrel law?"

Other candidates on the platform trembled, because it was a loaded question.

Mr. Schricker said calmly: "Glad you asked me, Charlie. I understand that half of my friends are for it and half are against it. I want it definitely understood that I'm for my friends."

The Man in the White Hat has passed on. Indiana is richer for his unselfish public service, and friendly interest in his fellow-man.

AL WYNKOOP.

[From the Indianapolis (Ind.) Star, Dec. 29, 1966]

MAN IN THE WHITE HAT

Small town boy, hard worker, dutiful son, quietly ambitious, modestly proud, possessed

of grass-roots shrewdness and a down-to-earth approach to the problems of politics and life, Henry F. Schricker was, in the most flattering sense, a "typical Hoosier."

His father was a German immigrant. The boy always needed money. Being busy sun-up to sundown became part of him at an early stage. But he had something else—political magic. Hard to define, it came from inside.

He spoke the people's language. He talked at county fairs, state fairs, church meetings, pitchin' in dinners, political rallies on the Main Streets of Indiana. He was at home on the banks of the Wabash, among the two-story buildings of towns where the courthouse and grain elevators were the only towering structures, among farmers still dusty from cornfields, barns, silos and hog lots. He understood the Hoosiers and they understood him.

Henry Schricker was above politics but not too haughty to join the rough-and-tumble. When he had to he did, facing a hostile majority, like lions waiting to devour a martyr in a Roman coliseum.

Need always spoke loudly to Henry Schricker, and he answered it, clerking in his father's grocery store, lacking funds to study law at the university. After high school he worked in the Starke County clerk's office and "read law" at night. He was admitted to the bar. He ran for county clerk and lost, a Democrat in a Republican stronghold. He became cashier of a small bank. Two years later he bought a weekly newspaper, and by pitching in and helping out with all jobs, he made it a success. He joined the Indiana Democratic Editorial Association and rose to president. He ran for the General Assembly and lost.

Everyone who wanted a job done well wanted Henry Schricker. He headed his county's Liberty Loan Drive in World War I. He was on the school board, was chief of the volunteer fire department, helped organize and was first president of the Knox Chamber of Commerce, was at the forefront of endless civic campaigns and programs.

He married a schoolteacher. They had three children.

Henry Schricker won his political spurs in the Democratic landslide of 1932, helped push through emergency legislation as a state senator in the 1933 General Assembly and made big enough impression to be nominated and elected lieutenant-governor in 1936. This helped pave the way for his first term as Governor in 1941.

But it was a Republican year in Indiana. He won by only 4,000 and faced a hostile GOP majority in the legislature which rammed through a series of "ripper" bills stripping his authority. Henry Schricker fought back tenaciously. He vetoed the bills. The GOP passed them again. This time he fought through legal channels. The State Supreme Court finally declared them unconstitutional.

Pearl Harbor came and the Governor—whose spotless white hat was now a trademark—spent most of his time turning Indiana's energies and resources to the war effort. In 1948 he became the first man to be elected to a second term as Indiana's Governor.

He hated, denounced and fought corruption with the zeal of a country preacher. He kept Indiana government on a pay-as-you-go basis and each year he was in office the state had a tidy surplus.

In the fullness of his years he was given many honors. He had won the trust and love of many thousands. He deserved it all, the slender, white-haired, blue-eyed man in the white hat.

It has been said that this nation is as great as the sum of its Main Streets. As long as its Main Streets produce men like Henry Schricker, its heart will be sound.

[From the Indianapolis News—Dec. 29, 1966]

HENRY F. SCHRICKER

The people of Indiana took Henry Frederick Schricker to their hearts with pride and reserved for him a respect and trust they extended to no other man in our time.

Now that he is gone it will be said, as it is often said carelessly, that we will not see his kind again. But in the passing of this man, it is true. Throughout his long and distinguished life he managed to retain the best of the eras in which he lived, and carried those qualities forward with an admirable grace and style and wisdom.

The confidence the people placed in him he earned. He did not merely talk of the old virtues. He practiced them, with his family, in his business and his public life, in the varied relationships he had with so many thousands of people in his lifetime.

When he said that public office was a public trust, when he talked of the meaning of freedom and democracy, when he spoke of a dedication to honest and efficient government those who listened, and many listened, came to know he meant what he said. They knew, regardless of party, and his support always cut across party lines, that very little would go wrong in the state-house as long as Henry Schricker was there. And very little ever did.

State senator, lieutenant governor, the only man in Indiana history twice elected to four-year terms as governor, twice his party's nominee for the U.S. Senate, he dominated Democratic politics in Indiana for two decades and after his active days were past his counsel and support continued to be sought.

His standing in Indiana and his appeal, though, went far beyond politics or even public service. He maintained a simple serenity, a sense of duty and a steadfast faith in the principles in which he believed, in whatever he did, and whether he was in or out of office.

Born of immigrant parents, Henry Schricker knew better than most what it meant to live in freedom. He chose, early in life, to do what he could to preserve and enlarge that freedom. He kept the faith.

[From the Indianapolis News, Dec. 30, 1966]

"HIS PEOPLE" PAY SCHRICKER TRIBUTE IN KNOX MORTUARY—LOVED BY ALL

(By Gerry LaFollette)

KNOX, IND.—Henry F. Schricker passed through here from his home town of North Judson in 1905 on his way to college, and he never really left.

Schricker first left this Starke County seat town in the early 1930s to go to Indianapolis and serve a term in the state Senate.

In 1936 he was elected lieutenant governor and four years later governor. In 1948 the voters again chose the man with the white hat to run the state.

No matter where he was—talking with Dwight D. Eisenhower at a 1950 dinner in the Columbia Club in Indianapolis or nominating Adlai Stevenson at the 1952 Democratic convention in Chicago—Henry F. Schricker always remained a man of the people.

The people who came last night to the Harry Price Funeral Home, in Knox, were his people.

On the announcement board at the funeral home was a list of three funerals—George H. Schmidt, Friday 2 p.m.; Henry F. Schricker, Saturday 1 p.m. and Edward D. Cowen, Sunday 1 p.m.

Price said Schmidt had worked "for the Chicago City Transit Authority as a conductor, or something, and had a heart attack and died. Cowen, who owned a filling station, slumped over in his chair Tuesday night and they found him next morning—his wife was in Chicago."

Wednesday afternoon Schricker died in Starke Memorial Hospital, just a few blocks up U.S. 35 from a sign that reads, "Welcome to Knox" and then, underlined, "Home of the Honorable Henry F. Schricker."

Last night, the family arrived about 7 p.m.; Mrs. Schricker, her two sons, Henry F. Jr. and George, her daughter, Mrs. Lewis C. Robbins, and most of their families.

The notice in the newspapers had said the public could come after 7 p.m. but some people had come earlier.

Two state troopers, Don Harner and Leo Commiskey from the Dunes Park Post, arrived at 6:30 p.m. Harner said their orders were to stand near the bronze casket "as long as it is open for public viewing."

TROOPERS SERVE AS HONOR GUARD

Until after 9:30 p.m., when the last person had left, the two troopers alternated standing at parade rest in their dress uniforms and white gloves.

Arthur Campbell, executive secretary to Schricker in the Governor's second term, said, "The Governor was always close to the state police, you know he introduced the bill in 1935 which set up the department."

Another early arrival was Ernest Zank, a small man in his early 60's, who took off his cap but wore his overcoat, scarf and rubber overshoes and held onto his cane. Price said, "Ernie shovels walks and mows lawns and takes care of the old folks in town, right, Ernie?"

Zank answered "Yep, I shoveled his walk just yesterday morning."

In answer to a question about Mrs. Schricker, Campbell said, "She's holding up pretty well. They took her to Plymouth this afternoon to buy her a new dress."

George Schricker said to one man, "It was nice of you to come." The man, pointing with his hat in his hand to the casket said, "It was nice of him . . . many times."

Ward Lane, warden of the State Prison at Michigan City, came in, shook his head, and said to Campbell, "I should have come down to see him the day before he died."

Lane, a career man with the Correction Department, was made superintendent of the Indiana Reformatory at Pendleton by Schricker. As Lane left he said, "I never went to him in my life that I didn't get consideration."

State trooper Howard Bashore, who lives here, said, "I drove the governor many times to Indianapolis. We went to Adlai Stevenson's memorial service together. I got to be real fond of that man."

FARM FOLKS SHOW RESPECT

One young man in a crew cut greeted Mrs. Schricker. She said, "Now, let's see, you're married." He answered, "Yes. Got two daughters. I'll bring them down to see you sometimes." Mrs. Schricker, seated on a couch, a small pink handkerchief clutched in her left hand, answered, "You do that."

William E. Shaw said, "I was his county chairman in 1948 when he was elected. I'll bet 50 to 60 per cent of this town turns out on Saturday. I never knew a man more respected or loved by his community."

Shaw identified some of the other callers: "That's Arnie Singleton. He's a farm boy from north of town. You'll see a lot of farmers in here tonight."

"He's Vance Good, runs a filling station. His father, Alvin, was about the governor's age and they were good friends."

"They're Mr. and Mrs. Earl Zechiel, lived right across the street from the governor for many years."

"He's a factory worker from the south end of town."

Henry F. Schricker:
Born Aug. 30, 1883.
Died Dec. 28, 1966.
Last night he belonged to the townspeople.

Today, he will belong to the Roger Branlins, the Matthew Welshes, the Harold

Handleys, the Frank McKinneys, the Frank McHales and the other dignitaries.
And then to history.

[From the Indianapolis Star, Jan. 1, 1967]
SCHRICKER BURIED AS STATE'S LEADERS BOW THEIR HEADS

(By Robert P. Mooney)

KNOX, IND.—The Honorable Henry Frederick Schricker, Hoosier political immortal who was elected twice Governor of Indiana, yesterday was buried beneath a patch of snow-covered ground about one mile east of Knox in Starke County under a gray wintry sky.

The 83-year-old patriarch of the Indiana Democratic Party died Wednesday in Starke Memorial Hospital.

A white hat, the symbol Mr. Schricker made famous during his long and popular career, was laid on top of a flower-blanketed casket as he was eulogized for "honesty, freedom and obedience."

The eulogy was made before more than 1,000 persons in the Knox Center Gymnasium by Dr. Otto P. Kretzman, a Lutheran minister and president of Valparaiso University.

"His simple, yet profound faith, had little use for theological argument but his honest and open faith in Jesus Christ as his Saviour must be mentioned in any biography," Dr. Kretzman said.

As a man who walked among both the great and lowly, Mr. Schricker had learned two great fundamentals for leading a successful Christian life, starting as a boy in his native North Judson, Dr. Kretzman said.

"The words, 'freedom and obedience' were the two words Mr. Schricker used as the touchstones for an honest life," he added. "These two words are seldom coupled in this modern and sometimes neurotic, self-centered age."

"Mr. Schricker knew that there could be no true freedom without true obedience and he used it in his daily task, to his friends and to his Founder in which he found wisdom and guidance," Dr. Kretzman said.

"And so the flags are flying at half mast all over the great state of Indiana today . . . not only for a former Governor . . . but for a good man, a man who for a half century reminded us that America can be great, if her sons and daughters are great . . . great in the knowledge of their manifest destiny . . . and in their freedom and obedience under God."

The son of German immigrants, Mr. Schricker's political career included election as a state senator, lieutenant-governor, and twice Governor. His two attempts to become United States senator were unsuccessful.

Mrs. Schricker, whom the late Governor married 52 years ago, and their two sons, Henry F. Schricker, Jr., and George Schricker, both of Indianapolis; a daughter, Mrs. Margaret Robbins of Washington, D.C., and six grandchildren sat together at the funeral ceremony.

Before the ex-Governor's casket was moved from the gymnasium for burial in Crown Hill Cemetery at Knox, the casket was opened briefly for the family only.

Mr. Schricker's great integrity and strict adherence to Jeffersonian principles gave him particular strength to conservative-minded Hoosiers from both political parties.

Dr. Kretzman opened the service with the reading of the 23d Psalm, "The Lord is my Shepherd."

A local quartet sang, "Nearer My God to Thee," and the minister opened his eulogy by saying that in the Christian ethic, "death brings no sorrow to those who die; it brings sorrow only to those who live."

Despite the family's request that flowers be omitted and that contributions be made to the Boys and Girl Scouts of America, the gymnasium stage and area surrounding the casket was covered with floral decorations.

The former Governor was buried with two high scouting awards—the Fleur de Lis, a gold badge imbedded with a diamond, presented in recognition of more than 50 years of scouting activity, and the Silver Buffalo medal, which was hung around his neck on a ribbon sash, the highest national award given by the Boy Scouts.

Troop 13 of the Knox Boy Scouts, second oldest troop in Indiana, which Mr. Schricker helped found more than 50 years ago, served as honor guard along with troopers of Indiana State Police.

Indiana political leaders of both parties attended the funeral. Governor Roger D. Branlign was the only man on the platform behind the casket with Dr. Kretzman.

Others attending included former Republican Governor Ralph F. Gates, who served between the two Schricker terms, and former Governors Harold W. Handley, a Republican, and Matthew E. Welsh, a Democrat.

U.S. Senators R. Vance Hartke and Birch E. Bayh, Jr., Indiana Democrats, headed a delegation of Hoosiers from Washington which included Democratic Congressman John Brademas of South Bend, Andrew Jacobs, Jr., of Indianapolis, and J. Edward Roush of Huntington, and Republican Congressmen William G. Bray of Martinsville, Richard L. Roudebush of Noblesville and Charles A. Halleck of Rensselaer.

Also John J. Barton of Indianapolis; State Treasurer Jack L. New; John A. Watkins of Bloomington, lieutenant-governor in Mr. Schricker's second term; Federal Judges S. Hugh Dillin and James E. Noland; former State Democrat chairman Ira L. Haymaker; Indiana attorney general John J. Dillon; Dr. Herman B. Wells, chancellor of Indiana University, and Arthur Campbell, Mr. Schricker's executive secretary when he was Governor.

Sheriffs' deputies from four surrounding counties helped form the honor guard.

Dr. Kretzman recalled in his eulogy that when the elder statesman returned to Knox after his second term as Governor he was asked why he chose to leave the State capital for a rural community.

Mr. Schricker replied: "Mom and I are at home here."

EXECUTIVE BRANCH REVIEW AND REFORM

Mr. ARENDS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Maryland [Mr. MATHIAS] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. MATHIAS of Maryland. Mr. Speaker, many commentators, in surveying the tasks ahead for the 90th Congress, have concluded that one of our most important jobs will be to review and refine the operations of the executive branch. Last Tuesday night, in his state of the Union message, the President gave this effort top priority when he declared:

We must see to it, I think, that these new programs that we have passed work effectively and are administered in the best possible way.

Because of the gravity and scope of this challenge, I am very pleased to announce that more than 20 of my colleagues have already joined me in re-introducing legislation—H.R. 69 and others—to establish a new, Hoover-type Commission on the Organization of the Executive Branch of the Government to conduct a comprehensive, objective as-

assessment of all Federal administrative operations and recommend overall reforms.

The need for such a review is unquestionable. During the past few years, the President and Congress have vastly expanded Federal activity in many fields, including urban development, health care, transportation, and education. These larger commitments have brought great administrative difficulties. Federal civilian employment by the end of 1966 had risen over 2.8 million; Federal paperwork last year cost more than \$8 billion. The sheer bulk of Federal operations has produced increasing confusion, inefficiency, and poor coordination, clear symptoms that the entire Federal Establishment is under tremendous strain. Many agencies, for example, are now unable to deal efficiently and effectively even with the most routine local and State applications for information and aid.

Of course, some efforts to reform, to increase coordination and to reduce red-tape have been made within individual departments and agencies, but these attempts have been fragmented, intermittent, and too often inconclusive. The Congress, too, has tried in particular cases, and will, I trust, be exercising its oversight powers even more energetically this year. Congressional review, however, is also fragmented by the divisions inherent in the committee system, and is seldom free from partisan considerations and the pressures of time.

Mr. Speaker, it is time for us to establish a body capable of taking a long look at the entire scope of Federal administrative operations. It is time for us to enlist in this work the best talents available in every field of American business, industry, education, and the professions. It is time for us to insist that the most advanced tools of modern management be applied in all aspects of the public business.

H.R. 69 would thus establish an independent, 14-member Commission to conduct a comprehensive, objective review, similar to those undertaken so successfully by the two Hoover Commissions of 1947-49 and 1953-55. The Commission would include two Senators, two Representatives, two Governors, two members from the executive branch, and six individuals from private life. It would be fully authorized to hire an expert staff, to conduct hearings and investigations, and to secure access to all relevant documents and information within all Federal departments, agencies, bureaus, and offices. The Commission would be required to submit period interim reports, including recommendations for changes and reforms, and to submit a final report to the Congress within 2 years.

In my judgment, such a review is fully in the public interest. The Commission's work would be tremendously helpful to the Congress, for it could supplement and integrate the inquiries made by individual congressional committees. It would aid the executive branch itself, by looking into problem areas which cross present jurisdictional lines, and by evaluating many proposals for reform which have not received top-level scrutiny or approval. It would have special

importance for State and local officials, who must now struggle with far too many intricate Federal forms and requirements, and who often find their best efforts undermined by Federal delay and indecision. Finally, the Commission's efforts would serve the American people by helping to guarantee that every taxpayer gets his full dollar's worth from his Government.

Finally, I am convinced that such a blue-ribbon Commission would approach the great task of review in a constructive, independent, and open-minded spirit, and would be by far the most appropriate and effective vehicle for identifying and advancing far-ranging reforms. I urge the Committee on Government Operations to give serious consideration to this bill, for in my judgment the alternative to such a reassessment will be simply creeping chaos and dangerous policy difficulties.

I would like to include at this point the names of the Members who, according to the Record of Thursday, have joined with me by sponsoring an identical or very similar measure this year:

Mr. MORSE of Massachusetts, Mr. WIDNALL, Mr. REID of New York, Mr. HALPERN, Mr. ERLBORN, Mr. ANDREWS of North Dakota, Mr. McDADE, Mr. KLEPPE, Mr. McCLORY, Mr. HOSMER, Mr. RUMSFELD, Mr. STANTON, Mr. ROBISON, Mr. REINECKE, Mr. STAFFORD, Mr. SCHWEIKER, Mr. CURTIS, Mr. CAHILL, Mr. CONTE, Mr. CRAMER, Mrs. DWYER, Mr. HORTON, Mr. KUYKENDALL, Mr. MORTON, Mr. WYDLER, Mr. WYMAN, Mr. DENNEY, and Mr. ANDERSON of Illinois.

CONGRATULATIONS TO ALLEGHENY AIRLINES

Mr. ARENDS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. CAHILL] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. CAHILL. Mr. Speaker, it is always encouraging to observe a real effort to service the needs of the general public by franchised companies who have exclusive rights. Many times such companies interpret these exclusive rights as absolute authority to conduct business as they see fit without regard to the public at large.

I, therefore, wish to compliment Allegheny Airlines and its president, Leslie O. Barnes, for recognizing the needs of the traveling public between Washington and Philadelphia, and by their act in providing better equipment and more service in the early evening hours when commuters are in the greatest need of accommodations.

Together with Congressmen BARRETT and SCHWEIKER, of Pennsylvania, I brought to the attention of Mr. Barnes some of the problems facing the commuter between Philadelphia and Washington in the early evening hours. His investigation confirmed our observations and the resulting implementation of new scheduling will, I believe, be of great service to the commuting public.

Congressman BARRETT and Congressman SCHWEIKER have asked me to say that they, too, join in congratulating Allegheny Airlines and Mr. Barnes.

REMARKS BY THE HONORABLE WILLIAM M. McCULLOCH TO THE COUNCIL OF THE INTERGOVERNMENTAL COMMITTEE FOR EUROPEAN MIGRATION IN GENEVA, SWITZERLAND

Mr. ARENDS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. CAHILL] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. CAHILL. Mr. Speaker, I was privileged to be a congressional delegate to the 26th session of the Council of the Intergovernmental Committee for European Migration in Geneva, Switzerland, during November 1966. A major item on the Council agenda was the review of ICEM's record of performance and consideration of a possible extension of ICEM's activities. The remarks of the ranking minority member of the Judiciary Committee, the gentleman from Ohio, WILLIAM M. McCULLOCH, on this subject were warmly received by the delegates from the 31-member nations of ICEM. I am pleased to have his speech inserted in the Record.

Mr. McCULLOCH's speech follows:

STATEMENT BY CONGRESSMAN McCULLOCH

Mr. Chairman, Members of the Council, its officers and its friends everywhere, I am honoured to have this opportunity to join in tribute to the achievements of the great humanitarian organization whose work you are carrying on.

The record of moving a million and a half refugees and migrants to freedom and opportunity, since the birth of ICEM at Brussels in 1951, is eloquent testimony both to the need for the organization and to its success. I am pleased, yes, even proud of what my country has done in this tremendous accomplishment.

Today, as we review this record we must also face the obvious fact that the nature of the refugee problem has changed and changed materially, and the needs of some of the people throughout the world for resettlement are much different from what they were only a few years ago.

I endorse the remarks of my long time, distinguished friend, Congressman Celler, which I view as a challenge to this organization—a challenge to re-evaluate its mission—to adjust its sights, in view of these unbelievably changing times. The expertise and "know-how" of ICEM must not be allowed to wither and die. The needs of the world and the problems of the dispossessed and depressed—the miseries of millions—cry out for solutions.

As an illustration of a new area of need, I recite to you the record of my country in reference to Cuban refugees. Since 1959 more than 300,000 Cubans fleeing oppression have been welcomed to our shores. We have spent more than \$215 millions for transportation, adjustment allowances, welfare payments, vocational training and other services to the Cubans.

The orderly United States airlift, in which we have had experience you know, which began December 1, 1965, day after day, regu-

larly as clockwork, is bringing in Cuban refugees at the rate of 4,000 each month. Of the more than 222,251 Cubans who have registered at our refugee centre in Miami up to November 4, 1966, some 119,529 have been resettled in more than 2,100 communities throughout the 50 states of our Union. The adjustment of these Cuban refugees with the invaluable assistance of the voluntary agencies and their absorption into the stream of our economic, social and cultural life has been a remarkable thing. I pay tribute to the energy, the initiative, and the creative ability of these Cuban refugees; thousands of whom have elected permanent residence and citizenship in my country. The Congress of the United States only recently enacted legislation to assist the Cubans in acquiring this United States citizenship.

As of this date, all of the "priority A" class of close relatives of Cubans in the United States have been admitted into the United States and reunited with their families. However, the list of those expressing a desire to come to the United States numbers approximately 750,000—one tenth of the total population of Cuba. Three-fourths of those admitted to the United States to date, other than housewives, children and students, have been classed as professional, semi-professional, managerial, clerical, sales, and skilled workers.

It is reasonable to conclude that those waiting in Cuba for escape from oppression represent a vast reservoir of similar skills.

Latin America urgently needs skilled and professional people. Why cannot this tremendous pool of manpower in Cuba, in addition to those of the European skilled workers, be directed where the need is greatest?

At the present rate of approximately 50,000 per year, the Cuban airlift will continue for a number of years. My country has welcomed and has absorbed a large number already. Why cannot ICEM lend its staff, its machinery and its "know-how" to assist in relocating these capable, energetic people in the Latin American countries where they are so badly needed? This is but an illustration of a situation where ICEM's experience and expertise will and should be most helpful. I challenge the Council to direct its attention to this area as well as to the other refugee problem areas of the world. Because ICEM has accepted responsibility and acquitted itself well, because it has the capability and the experience to meet the needs of refugees and migrants, wherever they may be, ICEM must accept the new challenges of our changing world. Thank you.

AVOIDABLE BANKRUPTCIES

Mr. ARENDS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. POFF] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD, and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. POFF. Mr. Speaker, during the past 25 years consumer credit in the United States has risen from an aggregate of \$9.2 billion to about \$93 billion. This has greatly contributed to the expansion of our national economy. Continued growth of sound and constructive consumer credit is being seriously jeopardized by the rapidly increasing rate of consumer bankruptcies filed in the country each year. In 1940, 39,073 nonbusiness bankruptcies were filed. In fiscal 1966, the figure was 176,000. Nonbusiness filings in 1940 amounted to 74.79 percent of the total bankruptcy filings.

In 1966 nonbusiness filings was 91.5 percent of the total. This startling rate increase will apparently continue as long as our consumer credit expands.

Today, many bankruptcy petitions are filed by individuals who have either lost interest in the orderly payment of their debts or have no knowledge of an alternative solution. Studies conducted by several universities have revealed that from 25 to 50 percent of wage-earner debtors who petition courts for a discharge in bankruptcy could pay their debts out of future earnings without undue hardship.

The Bankruptcy Act presently permits a wage-earner debtor who chooses not to proceed in straight bankruptcy to use a chapter XIII wage-earner plan under which such debtor can either pay his creditors in full over an extended period of time or effect a composition under which a percentage of his debts will be satisfied over a period of time. Taking the chapter XIII route benefits a wage earner in many ways: the stigma and consequences attached to a personal bankruptcy are avoided; contracts into which he has been induced through fraud or misrepresentation to enter may be entirely set aside or reformed; and payment of interest and finance charges on all claims classified by the court as unsecured may be eliminated. Chapter XIII wage-earner plans are also sufficiently flexible to allow the court to reduce payment by a debtor in case of unforeseen occurrences.

Chapter XIII, in the areas where its use has become widespread, has proven to be effective and of great value. Creditors in many instances have made substantial recoveries where chapter XIII has been used, whereas less than 10 percent of the straight bankruptcy cases throughout the Nation produce anything at all for creditors.

Unfortunately, utilization of chapter XIII has not been increasing as rapidly as one might hope. The reasons for failure to make use of chapter XIII appear to be threefold: First, a hesitancy on the part of referees to undertake supervision of chapter XIII plans; second, lack of knowledge of the existence of chapter XIII by the debtor; and third, a tendency to pursue straight bankruptcy as the easiest way out.

On the first day of the current session, I introduced H.R. 1057. This proposed amendment to the Bankruptcy Act would give the bankruptcy courts discretionary authority in appropriate situations to dismiss a voluntary bankruptcy proceeding where the wage earner fails to show that adequate relief cannot be obtained through a chapter XIII wage earner plan. Any debtor who shows that adequate relief could not be afforded by chapter XIII would in no way have either his right to file a bankruptcy petition or his right to a straight discharge affected by this amendment. The proposed amendment is designed only to improve the handling of cases involving wage earners by encouraging or stimulating implementation of chapter XIII in those instances where it reasonably appears that a debtor could pay his obligations out of future earnings without causing undue hardship.

Responsible judicial, business, civic, and church leaders have long been concerned over the demoralizing and detrimental effects of avoidable bankruptcies. H.R. 1057, which is similar to H.R. 292 introduced in the last Congress by the chairman of the Committee on the Judiciary, the gentleman from New York [Mr. CELLER] will help improve the situation.

A BUSINESSMAN AND HIS GOVERNMENT

Mr. ARENDS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. DERWINSKI] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. DERWINSKI. Mr. Speaker, one of the most gratifying developments in the past decade has been the very alert and effective public affairs programs augmented by our major corporations.

One of my constituents happens to be one of the pioneers and new leaders in the field of corporation public affairs.

Jim Patterson received a B.S. from Birmingham-Southern University in 1936 and a master's degree from Emory University in 1937. He became a supervisor of youth activities in the public relations department of Standard Oil Co., Indiana, in 1946. He later served as assistant director of public relations and director of field services in Standard's public relations department. In 1958 he moved to New York City as director of public relations of American Oil Co. Returning to Chicago in 1961, he transferred to the marketing department in 1963 and became manager of the Eau Claire, Wis., sales district. He again became director of public relations at Chicago in 1965. Mr. Patterson has played a leading role in petroleum industry public relations. He has served as national chairman of API's public relations advisory and employee information committees. Last October Mr. Patterson addressed the annual meeting of the National Lubricating Grease Institute in Chicago on the subject of "A Businessman and His Government." I felt this was an especially effective message and ask unanimous consent that it be reprinted in the RECORD at this point:

A BUSINESSMAN AND HIS GOVERNMENT

(By J. M. Patterson, American Oil Co., presented at the NLGI 34th annual meeting in Chicago, October 1966)

I'm very pleased that you've asked me to talk about business and government. Because I am sure that viscosity and pour-point are more familiar terms to you than, say, caucus and cloture, I'm particularly encouraged by the interest you're showing in the subject.

Since my specialty is public relations and public affairs, I may not be altogether unbiased—but I am thoroughly convinced that a knowledge of government and a concern for governmental activities ought to be a part of every businessman's intellectual and educational equipment.

This was important yesterday. Today and in the future, it is absolutely essential.

Businessmen—and I mean anyone involved in the management of a business or industry,

whatever their background may be—are going to have to learn to live successfully with government. It is closer to their lives now than ever before, and I see no signs that it won't be still closer in the future.

Already I can hear myself sounding like some of the speakers I've heard so often over the past 30 years. The burgeoning power of big government, they say, is leading us to socialism and bankruptcy and ruin. Federal regulation and encroachment on free enterprise, they add, are stifling the economy. If government would just go away and leave us alone . . .

Well, now—I think that as businessmen we have every right to be concerned about the tremendous growth in the power and influence of government. Certainly we can't ignore the way our activities, private as well as business, have become increasingly subject to some form of control by one or another agency at one or another governmental level. But at the same time, we might as well recognize two things: First, it is absolutely futile merely to complain about the trend. Second, it is equally futile to regard all government officials as fuzzy-minded bureaucrats, guided by a personal commitment to oppose business at every turn.

These, I'm afraid, have been the twin attitudes of all too many management people in American industry over the past three decades: complaint and suspicion. At best they have been grossly inadequate; often they've proved positively harmful.

What we must develop—what I think we are, slowly, developing—are some new and positive approaches to this relationship between business and government.

I've said that I was encouraged by your interest in this subject, and that's especially true because what I'm going to suggest will involve you—and people like you—much more deeply than most of you have been involved before. The approaches we need are not going to be easy to follow, and they can't be handled by the company president and his public affairs officer alone. Increasingly they are going to require the committed, active participation of others in the company, especially middle and upper management.

Business generally and businessmen individually are going to have to learn to spot potential trouble. This would be the first of the new, positive approaches: to identify those social and economic problems which, if they're left uncorrected, will lead inevitably to government-imposed solutions.

A case in point: Had the automobile industry had its ear a shade closer to the ground during the past few years, it might have heard the rumblings about auto safety. It might then have taken some action in advance to make some of the changes that now are being forced on the industry by government edict.

Case two: Business management had a hundred years to understand that the Negro, freed from slavery and awarded his constitutional rights as an American citizen, was entitled to equal opportunity for employment. This was a long time to have abdicated a social responsibility—and, in the end, government moved to speed up the process of correction which was moving all too slowly.

Air and water conservation is an area where our own oil industry is taking some effective steps to identify and help solve problems that concern all our citizens.

George Champion, chairman of the Chase Manhattan Bank, put the situation this way: "I can think of nothing that would put the brakes on big government faster than for business to identify critical problems and take the initiative in dealing with them before Washington felt the need to act."

And in that quote is the clue to a second new, positive approach I believe that business—and businessmen—must take toward

their relationship with government. After the problem is identified, take action—take it quickly—and take it locally wherever possible.

I'd like, if you'll forgive me, to use one illustration from my personal experience. As it happens, I'm opposed in principle to federal aid to education. I was equally opposed to it some years ago when I first moved to the community of Park Forest, Ill. The village was the newest of Chicago's south suburbs then—and it needed a good high school.

I was fortunate. I found a good many other citizens who, like me, didn't want the federal government to help us build a school under the federal impactment provision. We wanted our own, and we were determined to have a good one. In short, we'd rather do it ourselves.

If any of you have ever worked to pass a very substantial bond issue in a small community, you probably know something of what's involved. It takes time—time to study the problem, to canvass the neighborhoods, to talk to people, to round up support. It takes money and effort, too—to produce the materials, to make the telephone calls, to argue and persuade, and then to get people to vote. I found, too, that it takes a very considerable knowledge of politics on the local level. This is knowledge, believe me, that you acquire very quickly on a job like this.

In any event—to make a short story happy—we were able to pass the bond issue that gave us our own school.

It's a far cry, of course, from a school bond election in a Chicago suburb to some of the tremendous economic and social problems our people face in America today. And the third positive approach of a businessman to government is, I believe, to concede this basic difference.

After identifying problems and acting locally where we can, we must recognize that some problems are just too widespread and too complex for local solutions alone. *In these cases, we have to be willing to cooperate with others—including our government—to find and carry out solutions that are reasonable, practical and in the public interest.*

Air and water conservation is such an issue. A lot can be done—and responsible industry is doing a lot—on the local level to see that wastes from specific factories or refineries don't contribute to hazardous pollution. But over-all, the difficulties have been too great to allow us to depend on individual action by enlightened companies.

Here is an area where industry—consciously or not—faced a choice. It was not a choice of whether or not government would take action; that much was assured. The choice lay between cooperating with government or waiting until government felt compelled to assume full control and direction of the air-water conservation effort. For the most part, industry wisely chose to cooperate.

Sometimes the cooperation came on a project of relatively small scale. A paper company, for example, has worked directly with a commission of the state of Maryland to finance and build a four and one-half million dollar plant to clean up industrial wastes—and treat municipal sewage at the same time. And when communities along the lower end of Lake Michigan decided that something had to be done about lake and stream pollution, representatives of several industries in the area sat down with conservation officials and worked out a set of standards for water purity.

At other times, government-industry cooperation can be carried out on a much broader scale. ORSANCO—the Ohio River Sanitation Commission—has been a very effective combination of government and private-industry efforts to clean up serious pollution problems along the Ohio River.

The oil industry itself has provided one of the best examples of broad-scale cooperation with government in this field of conservation. There was a threat—and it still exists to some extent—that federal agencies would take the advice of "instant experts" and write into federal law all the tight, local restrictions developed in places like California to solve specific problems.

Oilmen agreed that something needed to be done—and they did two things: offered their cooperation to the federal agencies studying the issue and then took the initiative in seeking some practical solutions. First of all, they urged caution in adopting nationwide conservation rules that would be more restrictive and more costly than necessary. Then, through the API, the industry began its own research program—tied in with government efforts in the same direction. The purpose wasn't to prevent action, but to get the facts that are needed to take intelligent action.

Particularly this is true of air conservation, where the oil industry helped convince the Department of Health, Education and Welfare—and others—that we still know all too little about the real causes and effects of air pollution. In one instance, when government was studying a very restrictive regulation on the sulfur content of fuel oil the industry developed a monitoring plan designed to enable a community to take steps to avoid at much lower cost the kind of "killer-smog" incidents that made headlines in London, England, and Donora, Pa.

Cooperating with government—on this issue or any other—doesn't mean accepting uncritically what the government experts suggest and making the best of it. This informal partnership I'm talking about is like any other: It works best when both sides have something valuable to contribute. Business has much of value to contribute to a new working relationship with government.

One of the most valuable is the successful businessman's ability to evaluate and judge the effectiveness of a program. Our urban society has some vastly complex problems. They're going to be solved by someone. It seems to me that the role of the businessman is to deal with our every-day business problems. We examine any particular solution to determine whether it will be efficient or wasteful, practical or unrealistic. In our own work, we know well enough that a problem doesn't go away just because we can prove that one particular solution is too expensive or impractical. We just look for something better.

What we must do, I'm convinced, is to take this same analytical approach to the problems of society. Business can offer a great amount of expertise—and a considerable measure of creativity—in problem-solving. By doing so, it can play a significant part in the new, cooperative role with government in today's society.

Besides identifying problems and cooperating on solutions, there remains a third kind of positive approach that I'm suggesting for the businessman and his relations to government. It's a change in his traditional attitude toward the people in government—the public servants, if you will.

That attitude has all too often been one that divides all government people into two classes: politicians and bureaucrats. And just by using those two words, we've implied that politicians are interested only in votes, while bureaucrats want only to boost their own power and prestige. We haven't been willing to recognize that these are people facing big problems.

Particularly we've tended to kid ourselves that government people, when they talk or act in a way we don't like, are just perversely anti-business through some quirk in their own nature. Granted—there have been some horrible examples of just this kind of law-maker or administrative officer in Washington. There have also been some horrible

examples of businessmen to whom every move, every suggestion emanating from the government is automatically wrong.

Today's times and conditions demand a different response. We'd better learn—and learn soon—that government officials represent people. Elected officials, of course, depend for their survival on responding to the wishes of their constituents. But more than that—the administrative officers in agencies and bureaus, whose job is to carry out government policy, must also respond at least indirectly to what the majority of American people want.

If Congress and government agencies call for action on stream pollution or highway beautification and safety, we'd better believe that it's because the citizens back home want action on stream pollution and highways. And we'd better not forget that these people back home are our customers—we're just as dependent on responding to their needs and opinions as any government official.

What's more, we stand to gain a great deal by treating representatives of government as if they were the rational, reasonable people that, in fact, they are. One of the things our industry's representatives have learned in recent dealings with Washington is that the technicians and specialists in government are eager to hear from all sides of an issue—particularly from business. They will listen to the reasoned, practical solution of a problem—if we offer it to them.

The same thing is true of legislative bodies. Ted Sorenson, as former special counsel to President Kennedy, had plenty of opportunity to work with and to judge Congress and Congressmen. Here's what he says about the men and women on Capitol Hill:

"Today, compared with a generation ago, those men and women are better educated and better informed; better acquainted with more issues . . . better staffed and briefed . . . less likely to be new members and more likely to be re-elected . . . more responsible to the public interest . . . (and) more responsive to public opinion."

And while I'm quoting, here's what Ben Heineman, chairman of the Chicago and Northwestern Railway, says about the same subject:

"I have never believed that political bodies are inherently unreasonable. I am convinced that if our arguments are rational, if we are discriminating in what we oppose and propose, and if we admit that there are problems that must be solved by government, we will get a much fairer hearing in the legislative halls . . ."

I agree with Mr. Heineman—and I would add this thought, too: We businessmen will get a much fairer hearing if we talk less loudly about the evils of all government regulation of business. Not only do we sound as if we're living in the past, we leave ourselves open to the charge of hypocrisy.

For, after all, we accept—and even embrace—some forms of federal regulation. We accept the protection the Food and Drug Administration offers our health. And we accept the regulation of currency by the Federal Reserve Board, of the stock market by the Securities Exchange Commission, and of competition by the antitrust laws.

We have no more reason, of course, to accept all forms of government regulation without protest than we have to condemn them all without study. What we must do, once again, is to bring reasoned judgment to bear—reasoned judgment of any new proposal for solving a difficult problem, reasoned judgment of the man or men who are making the proposal.

When we can do that—and the job isn't an easy one—we're on the right road to a profitable and positive new relationship between business and government in this country.

Now, this is all very well so far. Business should do this, government should do this.

All rather ethereal and not very practical to a man who's attending the annual meeting of the National Lubricating Grease Institute.

Let's get this matter straightened out now. My title today isn't "Business and Government;" it's "A Businessman and His Government."

There are some things that you as a businessman can do to help carry out these new, positive approaches to dealing with government. And you don't have to be a board chairman or a president to do them. Likewise—you don't have to hop the next plane for Washington and start trying to lobby your Congressman.

You begin, like charity, at home. You take part in the public affairs of the community where you live.

I don't, in this particular instance, mean by taking over that vacant job as Scoutmaster or by leading the fund-raising efforts of your local Community Chest. These are civic affairs—and worthy ones. What's more, I expect most of you are already doing a fine job in this kind of work. But is this enough?

Suppose, in your town, you had the same relationship with the mayor that you have now with, say, the head of the United Fund or the president of the local university. Suppose the city council, looking at a proposed ordinance involving the oil business, knew you and respected your opinion enough to ask your advice. There's no reason why these hypothetical cases can't be real. And it doesn't take much imagination to see how this kind of friendly relationship between local business and local government could be beneficial to all concerned.

Why not begin by asking yourself a few questions about the government of the town where you live. Are your public officials honest and efficient? Does the city provide the services it should—the police and fire protection, the water, the streets and sewers? Is the law enforced impartially? How reasonable are the budgets of the local taxing bodies? Does the community have enough facilities such as hospitals, parks, shopping areas and libraries?

Now, as your next step in civic responsibility, find the answer. As you search for them, you're going to find yourself more and more deeply involved with the administration of local government. You'll be attending the meetings of the city council, or the board of zoning appeals, or some special committee appointed to handle a specific problem. You'll be meeting the people who are in government. And while you'll probably do most of the listening and little of the talking in the early stages, you'll find that soon they'll be listening to you. Provided, of course, that you've taken a reasonable attitude and offered some constructive ideas.

Out of this knowledge of local people and local issues you'll be able to spot potential problems before they become acute. And perhaps, too, you'll be able to offer some reasonable solutions before someone else steps forward with one of those grandiose, appealing, but completely unrealistic ideas that so often appear.

One of the things that *won't* help you, or your company, is the attitude that you can get out of your responsibilities with little money. I know there are some people who openly boast that a donation of a thousand dollars will get practically anybody off their backs. But money doesn't do for you—or for your community—what work and service do.

Rousseau made the point in these words: "As soon as public service ceases to be the chief business of the citizen, and they would rather serve with their money than with their persons, the State is not far from its fall."

Inevitably—as you do begin to take an active part in community affairs—you will find yourself involved to some extent in party

politics. Don't let the idea frighten you. Welcome it.

There's nothing disreputable about party politics. There can be, and sometimes are, disreputable men in politics. But the system of parties itself has been the operating basis of our government for most of our history as a nation. Party politics is a fact of life in our society today—and any businessman who deals with government deals with politics and politicians.

There are a couple of good reasons why it will pay you, as a businessman, to take an active role in the work of a political party. One of them is your own education. Unless you're already a party worker, by becoming one you can learn a lot about what makes a political party—and a government—work.

You may be one of the people who has complained that "government ought to be run the way I run my business." This is usually followed by the observation that "the trouble with government people is that they never had to meet a payroll."

Perhaps. But it may not have occurred to you that the government people have been saying to themselves that "the trouble with businessmen is that they never had to carry a precinct."

And they're right. Don't hesitate to volunteer for some work with the party of your choice. Your education will start the first time you work on a voter-registration campaign—or the first time you have a talk with a precinct captain.

At the same time, you'll learn to know the local political leaders—to know them as personalities, and to know what they stand for.

Finally—in time—your continued activity in the party will earn for you the right to speak—to offer your opinions—to exert your own influence on the choice of candidates and on the stand which your party takes on important public issues. It's at this point that you will begin to make the kind of creative contribution that each of us ought to be trying to make toward good government.

There still remains one effort which the individual businessman should be willing to make in his search for a meaningful relationship with government—an effort to know and understand the elected officials who represent him in local government, in the state legislature and in Congress.

The more active you become in party politics, of course, the more likely you'll be to know a legislator—even a Congressman—on a first-name basis. But even more important than knowing him personally is your ability to recognize the problems he faces, the pressures under which he operates, and the knowledge he may or may not have about a particular issue.

Even the most well-meaning Congressman can be led into a serious error in judgment if he hears arguments on only one side of an issue. He needs your information and your help when the issue at stake is one on which you're qualified to speak. Sometimes he'll ask for your opinion. With his busy schedule, however—with the multitude of issues he has to deal with—it's not likely that he will. But he'll welcome a constructive idea when you volunteer it. And if it's a good idea, he'll be encouraged to seek you out the next time he's faced with a bill that affects your business.

In the words of C. E. Reistle, board chairman of Humble:

"Businessmen have got to learn that government people don't have horns . . . Few Washington officials really want to be unreasonable. They are trying—most of them—to do a conscientious job of public service. But they can use assistance from business, and we should be willing to provide it in an atmosphere of tolerance and understanding."

Now—how often you, personally, will have the chance to appear on Capitol Hill on behalf of your company is problematical. But

I would remind you of two things: One—you can make known your opinions as an individual and offer your informed judgment on an issue where you're concerned and knowledgeable. Two—professional lobbyists, even the highly touted ones, are rarely as effective with a member of Congress as a knowing, concerned businessman himself.

It's much easier, of course, for a businessman to hide behind his trade association. We in the oil industry can, if we want, rely on the API to deal with the issues at the federal level. But we can often do more—and be more effective—by knowing and helping our own Congressmen. And certainly we can't expect the API to handle our problems with the city council or the zoning board.

Officials at the local level of government—even more than those in Washington—are likely to need the kind of technical information you can provide. Before they can make sound decisions, they have to have the same kind of data a businessman needs to solve his problems—but it's not often that they have either the time or the money to get it.

One formula that has worked successfully is the formation of a local research council to provide technical know-how to municipal and county governments. Several companies with major plants along the Texas Gulf Coast joined in an effort like this a few years back. They formed what was called the Galveston County Research Council.

When the county tax assessor's office needed technical information on tax records and data processing, for example, experts from the cooperating companies were able to provide it. Purchasing people from the industries helped the county set up a more efficient system of buying stores and equipment. Engineers were able to provide technical data to help evaluate proposals for capital improvements.

In all these ways, and more, businessmen like you were able to contribute some of the know-how of modern industry to the solution of public problems. And for those of you who might still hesitate at the prospect of diving headlong into partisan politics, this kind of cooperative effort makes a good place to start broadening your participation in public affairs.

I'm sure this isn't the first time you've heard an appeal for you to become active in public life, to discharge your duty as a business citizen. I wouldn't be at all surprised if, on these occasions, you had protested to yourself that your duty as a company manager is to help produce a profit for the company stockholders, not to spend time and effort trying to pass bond issues or win elections.

But business management, it seems to me, has a dual responsibility—to the stockholders, of course, but to the public as well. And there's no reason to consider that the two are mutually exclusive. It's obvious that a successful company should be making a current profit for its stockholders. But—in addition—its management should be concerned with creating that economic and political environment in which future profits are possible.

And there is no better way that I know of ensuring a favorable public climate in the future than by carrying out our responsibility to the public today.

The new breed of businessman recognizes this. And the new relationship that's developing between business and government rests on this point: that being a good businessman and being a good business citizen are both part of the same role. To be one is to accept the responsibility of the other.

Your ability to take on this new role requires of you two things: One is a knowledge and understanding of public problems; this you get by becoming a part of your community, by being active in its development. The other is a willingness to become involved

with people, to help them work out solutions to the issues they face in our society.

How do you acquire that willingness to be involved? I'm not sure that I can give you any formula that will help if you don't already recognize the basic obligation. But I do know that the root of the word "businessman" is "man." And I know that the relationship of a businessman and his government is—at its best—the same as that of any other man to his government: a relationship of active participation, reasoned cooperation, and real understanding.

For a man and his government are going to remain very close neighbors in the years ahead. They'll do well to know each other and live peaceably together.

HISTORICAL LESSONS FOR EAST-WEST TRADE

Mr. ARENDS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. DERWINSKI] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. DERWINSKI. Mr. Speaker, it is quite evident that the administration and some circles in this country are determined on liberalizing trade with the Red empire in the naive hope that this would appease the totalitarian Red regimes and render them more peaceable. Through Executive decree and action we have already gone too far in shipping goods of strategic military and cold war value to Moscow and its Red associates. All this, while the U.S.S.R., Poland, Czechoslovakia, Rumania, East Germany and others shore up the Hanoi regime to kill Americans in South Vietnam.

REPETITION OF OLD ERRORS

The directions of our present trade policy toward Eastern Europe are not only irrational in the present context but they also defy all the historical lessons we should have learned from our trade with similar totalitarian powers in the thirties. Old errors are being repeated with the same illusions that such trade contributes to peace, understanding, and good will.

A very interesting study on "Historical Lessons in Totalitarian Trade" appears in the November-December 1966 issue of the *Intercollegiate Review*. Based largely on hitherto classified papers in the Department of Commerce, the study was prepared by Dr. Lev E. Dobriansky, professor of economics at Georgetown University. In the forthcoming debate on East-West trade I urge all Members to read this documented article carefully. The lessons we have forgotten or never learned should be sufficient to call for a complete, critical review of our present policy and to formulate a realistic political trade policy based on political freedom concessions. I request that the article "Historical Lessons in Totalitarian Trade" be printed in full in the RECORD:

HISTORICAL LESSONS IN TOTALITARIAN TRADE
(By Lev E. Dobriansky)

(NOTE.—Dr. Dobriansky is professor of economics at Georgetown University. The origi-

nator and author of the *Captive Nations Week Resolution* enacted by Congress, he is the author of *The Free Ideal and Veblenism: A New Critique*.)

Those who cannot remember the past are condemned to repeat it.

Santayana's wise dictum cannot be repeated too often when it comes to present pressures for liberalizing trade with the totalitarian Communist Empire. As are many in Western Europe, a number of circles in the United States are prepared, at whatever cost, to repeat the errors of the not-too-distant past.

Concerning the present, there is no mystery about the needs and goals of all sectors of the Communist Empire: their desperate need for advanced Western technology, their economic deficiency in both capital and consumer goods, their aim in overcoming glaring economic defects for general psycho-political reasons, their requirements of surplus resources destined for intensive and extensive Cold War aggression, and their continuous improvement of space technology and the military machines strewn about the empire. One would think the heavy Russian material commitment in Viet Nam is in itself sufficient cause not only to drop the liberalization idea but also to wage a Free World campaign for curtailed trade with the empire. However, the Bear and his associates have set an economic trap for us, and we are prone to fall into it. The nature and outline of this trap require a separate discussion; our concern here is with certain prominent, historical lessons for the present, drawn from U.S. trade with other imperio-colonialist totalitarian powers.

Research into U.S. trade with the totalitarian states of Japan, Germany, and Italy before World War II discloses several powerful truths which many persons involved in the current discussions of East-West trade do not know or have completely forgotten. The logical period covered is that of the 1930's, after Japan had begun its aggression in Manchuria, Germany had come under Hitler's rule, and Mussolini's Italy had embarked upon its imperialistic adventure in Abyssinia.

The chief focus of attention is on the strategic commodities furnished by the United States through normal export channels to these powers. To some extent imports are also considered since they constitute a source of dollar balances available to the aggressive powers for purchases elsewhere. Strange as it may seem, much of the material presented here was only recently declassified upon my own request. No one had bothered to tap these sources and approach the subject from the angle developed here.

Although no two historical periods or occasions are ever precisely alike, in certain essential respects they can be rationally compared, particularly in terms of the repetition of human error. At this moment we can profit immensely from the 1930's and their historical lessons in totalitarian trade. True, Japan, Germany, and Italy were have-not nations, heavily dependent on trade and raw material imports: on this limited scale the Soviet Union and Communist China are not so dependent. However, Japan, Germany, and Italy were basically nation-states; the Soviet Union and Communist China are fundamentally empire-states, with all the potential disadvantages accruing to such a status.

On the broader scale of an imperialistic Cold War economy, both the Soviet Union and Communist China with the inclusion of their "external satellites" are have-not states in terms of capital, latest technology of a broad spectrum, and even certain strategic raw materials. Significantly, all of these totalitarian states were and are punctuated by self-sufficiency drives and ersatz developments. Of supreme importance is the

sharp difference between the blunt, crude, aggressive behavior of the earlier totalitarian powers and the studied, subtle political warfare of the present totalitarian states, for whom trade is a vital Cold War instrument.

By way of introductory generalizations, the following selected and only partial data reveal (1) unmistakable U.S. contributions were made to the war economies of Japan, Germany, and even Italy prior to World War II; (2) the weight of our economic influence was far greater over Japan than over Germany or Italy, though in combination with Great Britain, France, and several Latin American countries our decisive influence could have been exerted over Germany and Italy, too; (3) marked discrepancies exist between the observations and conclusions of several hitherto classified studies and the judgments and decisions of the leadership in the 1930's; (4) a review of the arguments and counterarguments in the 1930's suggests that we are going through another cycle, with a generation that in some areas has forgotten the arguments and lessons of that period as concern trade with imperialistic totalitarian states; and (5) projecting the lessons of the 1930's to the present, we see a need for even tighter controls, since under global Cold War conditions the nature of a strategic good is far more extensive than it was three decades ago. Regarding the last, we are better armed now with certain trade controls, but because of our inadequate grasp of what the Cold War means and involves, we are still unsure about the scope of a "strategic good;" we are vulnerable to helping the enemy today. As will be shown, some executive analysts in the 1930's knew then what the nature of a strategic good meant in relation to an imperialistic totalitarian economy.

UNITED STATES AND JAPANESE WAR ECONOMY

The tremendous economic assistance we gave to the Japanese war economy, either directly or indirectly through Manchuria, Korea, or China, suggests the possibility of a striking parallel with the present totalitarian states. The commodities we shipped to Japan and the "yen bloc" enabled Japan to prosecute its wars in Manchuria and China, to liquidate American businesses in those areas, and to prepare for general war. The parallel intimated for today would be our growing economic assistance to the USSR and the "Soviet bloc," enabling this sector of the Communist Empire to intensify its Cold War in targeted areas of the Free World, to negate progressively our foreign aid in many underdeveloped areas, and eventually to squeeze out any American or Western business interests and prepare for the oft-repeated "Communist takeover."

Literally ten years have to be accounted for in our contributions to the build-up of the Japanese war economy. Without controversy or contradiction, one can determine the beginning of this period with Nippon's conquest of Manchuria in 1931. The year marks not only the start of Japan's imperialist advances but also the unfolding of its plans for economic self-sufficiency and a closed economic sphere in the New Order of the Far East.¹ It was the beginning drive for a self-sufficient "yen bloc." With the steady expansion in Japan's industry since 1931, Japanese demands for scrap iron, steel, crude oil, copper, and tin plate increased.² But, as had been shown time and time again, "The most serious weakness in Japan's industrial self-sufficiency insofar as a war economy was concerned was her deficiency in impor-

tant industrial raw materials, notably iron ore, pig iron, and petroleum products."³

In 1932, Secretary of State Henry L. Stimson sought economic sanctions against Japan, but it was evident that he and other advocates found few allies among the members of the Fourth Estate.⁴ Walter Lippmann, for example, writing in his *New York Herald Tribune* column, "Today and Tomorrow" (March 26, 1932), said of the United States: "It should oppose a one-sided embargo on munitions as inconsistent with the general policy of non-intervention by force." The theme, "Embargo would mean war," ran through all of the opposition, right up until 1940. Lippmann himself changed his tune by 1937, after Roosevelt's Quarantine Address.

Prior to 1932 every year indicated a trade balance in favor of Japan. After 1933 it favored the United States. The depreciation and devaluation of the dollar helped Japan considerably. In 1933-34 it imported larger quantities of machinery of all kinds from the United States and Germany. In 1934 the Japanese Government adopted a Petroleum Industry Law, which placed the industry under close governmental control. As one analyst put it, "Lack of oil resources was perhaps the most vulnerable aspect of Japan's economy and steps were taken early to attempt to overcome this handicap."⁵ For the "Greater East Asia Coprosperity Sphere," the "yen bloc," stockpiling, and war, a top priority was oil. American exports to the end of the decade helped immensely.

Beyond any shadow of doubt, Japan's policy in the 1930's was designed not only to organize production for self-sufficiency and strengthen the military, but also to conquer areas rich in materials which Japan lacked. In the latter half of 1936 and early 1937, marked shortages of pig iron and steel developed. From 1936 on, when cotton accounted for 43% of total Japanese imports from the United States, Japan concentrated on the expansion of industries supplying military necessities and imposed severe restrictions on imports of cotton, wood pulp, and other commodities entering into the production of consumers' goods. Before Pearl Harbor a Commerce Department analyst observed, "Since that year (1936) however, Japan has concentrated on the expansion of its heavy industries at the expense of its export industries, purchasing increasing quantities of scrap iron, steel-mill products, machine tools and petroleum products largely from the United States."⁶ Significant, too, is the fact that after 1936 Japan instituted a statistical blackout on its imports of ore, metals, autos, parts, and the like.

In July, 1937, the Japanese Army moved into China. Through its representatives China raised the question of economic sanctions against Japan but received no support.⁷ Tightening its trade controls, on September 9 Japan passed an Emergency Trade Control Law, intensifying the development of its imperial self-sufficiency program. In that period official and unofficial observations make for interesting reading and reflection. A State Department analysis pointed out, "Although during the first half of 1937 the expansion in U.S. export trade with Japan was inclusive in its scope (with cotton sharing in the general rise), increases were most marked in the metal, iron and steel, petro-

leum, machinery, and vehicle groups, reflecting the accumulation of stocks of war materials and the government's program of speeding up the development of heavy industries. During the last half of 1937, when selective import controls became effective under conditions of actual war, American exports to Japan showed a predominantly military character."⁸

SOME SELECTED DATA

A Commerce Department analysis then stressed these many points: (1) our trade with Japan for 1937 showed an unusually large expansion over 1936—\$288,378,000, the highest figure since 1920 and an advance of \$84,030,000 or 41.1% compared with 1936; imports increased by 18.8% over 1936, and for the sixth consecutive year the United States enjoyed an export excess with Japan; (2) in 1937, Japan was our third principal export market, accounting for 8.6% of our total export trade; (3) crude materials and semi-manufactures for Japan's expanding industries constituted the bulk of American goods supplied to that country, semi-manufactures about 43.3% of total to Japan, raw materials 32%; (4) scrap iron and steel and tin scrap increased to \$39,278,000 from \$14,177,000 in the previous year, with an equally sizeable increase in tonnage; (5) exports of refined copper jumped from 79,852,000 pounds valued at \$7,293,000 in 1936 to 145,689,000 pounds valued at \$17,997,000 in 1937; (6) these gains plus smaller increases in exports of wire rods, tin plate, scrap copper, and lead brought total exports of metals and manufactures, except machinery and vehicles, up to a value of \$104,423,000 compared with \$28,842,000 in 1936; (7) exports of nonmetallic minerals increased from \$29,769,000 in 1936 to \$44,821,000 in 1937, largely due to heavier shipments of crude oil; and (8) shipments of American machinery and vehicles to Japan assumed large proportions, \$34,202,000 in 1937 compared with \$20,459,000 in 1936, with power-driven metal-working machinery accounting for most of the increase.⁹

It is quite evident that analysts in our executive agencies were acutely cognizant of what was then transpiring. To cite another example, State Department papers reveal that:

in 1937 Japan was engaged in building up large stocks of raw materials and materials of a military and heavy industry character. During the latter part of the year 1937 and throughout 1938, Japan was engaged in hostilities in China. The increased imports of Manchuria in 1937 and 1938 from non-Japanese sources were obviously connected with Japan's preparation for an execution of military operations, and the figures for those years warrant no inference that Japan's occupation of Manchuria has more widely opened the doors of commercial opportunity or benefited American enterprise in Manchuria. By administrative measures of a discriminatory character, American business enterprises have been excluded from the field of distribution within Manchuria. Preferences in force, favoring Japanese enterprises, have compelled many American enterprises to withdraw from Manchuria and have discouraged other American enterprises from operating in Manchuria.¹⁰ Meanwhile, as statistics show, U.S. exports of strategic goods to Manchuria increased substantially in this period.

¹ Kate L. Mitchell, *Japan's Industrial Strength* (New York, 1942), p. 26.

² An illuminating record on this in Richard Grigg, *Japanese-American Relations, 1930-1937* (Washington, 1950).

³ Jerome B. Cohen, *Japan's Economy in War and Reconstruction* (1949), p. 23.

⁴ Victoria C. Hungerford, *Effects on American Economy of an Embargo on Exports to Japan*, Department of Commerce, February 26, 1941.

⁵ Arnold Toynbee, *Survey of International Affairs*, 1937, p. 289.

⁶ *Analyses of United States Import Trade with Japan in 1937*, U.S. Department of State, April 12, 1938.

⁷ *United States Trade with Japan, Including Taiwan and Chosen—1937 Compared with 1936*, U.S. Department of Commerce, 1938.

⁸ *Papers Relating to the Foreign Relations of the United States, Japan: 1931-1941* (Washington: U.S. Government Printing Office, 1943), I, 156.

¹ Isoshi Asahi, *The Economic Strength of Japan* (Tokyo, 1939), p. 324.

² *Trends in United States-Japanese Trade*, U.S. Department of Commerce, Special Circular No. 333, June 1, 1935.

There are many angles from which statistical data may be viewed and evaluated, but in this case the data point largely and conclusively in one direction: Japanese war preparations and our heavy contribution to them. In terms of the percent distribution of U.S. trade with selected Far Eastern countries, Japan ranked second producer of our imports for 1926-30 with 9.4% of the total; by 1937, it ranked third with 8.6% of the total. As concerned our exports to the Far East, Japan ranked fourth for the earlier period, with 5.2% of the total, and third in 1937 with 8.6%. Viewing the subject from the angle of Japan's total volume of imports and exports after the Manchurian crisis, Japan's percentage of import trade with the United States was 36.5% in 1931-32 and 33.6% in 1937, ranking first among selected Far Eastern countries in both periods; its export trade showed the same rank for the two periods, with 32.1% in 1931-32 and 20.6% in 1937.

One fairly accurate, private analysis shows that between 1936 and 1937, U.S. exports to Japan increased by 41%, but a breakdown of the export figures by commodities discloses an increase of about 124% in shipments of war essentials. The American share in Japan's imports of materials essential for war purposes was in 1937 the following: as a percentage of total Japanese imports in copper, 92.9%; automobiles and parts, 91.2%; all oil, 60.5%; pig iron, 41.6%; other iron, 59.7%; machinery and engines, 48.5%; zinc, 20.4%, with a total in the aggregate 54.4%.¹¹ In other words the weight of the U.S. contribution to the war economy of Japan was almost twice what Japan's aggregate figures of imports from the United States indicates.

Some recognition of these dangerous trends was registered in President Roosevelt's Quarantine Speech in 1937. However, by all accounts, the speech was vigorously opposed by major segments of the press and, we shall see, the President retreated and his Administration shrank from economic measures as had the Hoover Administration in 1931-33. Nevertheless, reports then and many years later continued to relate the same story. One forthright report submitted by a Far Eastern expert in the Department of Commerce stated, "Let us, then, in our realistic interpretation of statistic call Japan's heavy industries by their right name—war industries—and let us recognize that our sales of scrap iron and steel are going into aerial bombs for final 'distribution' in China to an unwilling 'consuming public'—the defenseless Chinese civilians, men, women, and children."¹²

When some speak of the "good customers" in the present Red Empire, they should read this report on the "good" Japanese cash customer. Confirming much of this from hindsight, another analyst, in her coverage of Japanese trade from 1937 into the first nine months of 1940, wrote, "During this period, Japan was seriously preparing for war, and its trade figures reflect these preparations."¹³

CONGRESSIONAL AND ADMINISTRATION VIEWS

Certain developments in 1938 shed further light on this whole issue. Congressional restlessness with the existing situation began to appear. For instance, in June, Senator Pope of Idaho spoke out in this vein: "It is just as well . . . for us to recognize the bitter fact that it is America which is supplying 54.4 per cent of the materials ab-

solutely necessary in order that Japan may continue her aggression against China."¹⁴ Figures compiled from the Commerce Department's *Far Eastern Financial Note* (No. 246, January 19, 1938) disclose that the British Empire supplied 17.5% of such materials. The following month, in July, the United States finally initiated a hesitant policy of economic pressure against Japan.

A "moral embargo" was put into effect despite the objections of Ambassador Grew, our representative in Japan. As a matter of fact, until the latter part of 1940, Mr. Grew was against economic sanctions, because they would worsen our relations with the aggressive power and would lead to war.¹⁵ He urged a new commercial treaty with Japan when later the 1911 treaty was scrapped. It was not until September 12, 1940, that in a long dispatch he finally called for stern economic measures.¹⁶ However, in light of the situation a "moral embargo" was scarcely adequate for the purposes intended. Pointing out a fact reiterated by many others, a well-known scholar recently wrote, "With the exception of the 'moral embargo,' which had been in force since the summer of 1938 and which effectively prevented aircraft, aircraft equipment, and aerial bombs from going to Japan from the United States, Japan could still secure from this country all the oil, copper, scrap iron and steel, automotive equipment, and other materials useful to a military machine that it wished."¹⁷ Right up to 1940, Japan maintained its third place in U.S. export trade, yielding its place in that year to France because of the latter's war demands for goods.

Commodity-by-commodity data substantiate what a Department of Commerce report on Japan stated in 1940, that "there has been a greater demand over the past few years for metal-working machinery, petroleum products, iron and steel products, copper and other materials entering into its heavy industries—petroleum and products \$45,290,000 in 1939 amounted to 19.6% of our total exports to Japan; metal-working machinery \$24,578,000 in 1939 and \$23,627,000 in 1938, 1939 being 10.6% of total export value. Also exceeding 1938 values were exports of iron and steel scrap, steel bars and rods, refined copper. . . ." This report merely extended by one year the general conclusion arrived at in an earlier one: "In the past two years Japan has concentrated its efforts on the expansion of heavy industries rather than on the export industries."¹⁸

On April 27, 1939, the Senate Foreign Relations Committee had before it the Pittman Resolution (S.J. Res. 123), authorizing the President to end trade with Japan. There were a number of such resolutions. Secretary of State Cordell Hull suggested that they be deferred. Senate Resolution 166, submitted by Senator Vandenberg, called for the abrogation of the 1911 commercial treaty in six months. By July 26 the United States notified Japan by formal notice of its intention to terminate the Treaty of Commerce and Navigation on January 26, 1940. Thus, after six months we would be free to control or cease our exports to and imports from Japan. It is noteworthy that at the beginning of 1939 the Secretary of State planned to denounce some sections of the treaty and to substitute for these certain short-run and commercial agreements.¹⁹ There can be no

¹⁴ James P. Pope, "Sales of War Materials by the United States to Japan," U.S. Senate, June 8, 1938.

¹⁵ Ambassador Grew to Secretary Hull, *Far Eastern Military Tribunal*, Defense Document No. 1400-U-2, Exhibit No. 58, Reject No. 315.

¹⁶ Anthony Kubek, *Japanese-American Relations 1937-1945* (Washington, 1956), p. 188.

¹⁷ Meridith C. Cameron, *China, Japan and the Powers*, 2d ed. (New York, 1960), p. 483.

¹⁸ Footnote not supplied.

¹⁹ Herbert Feis, *The Road to Pearl Harbor* (Princeton, 1950), pp. 21-22.

question that expression of Congressional sentiment led to a stronger stand, such as it was.

Even at that, when the Secretary announced our intent to abrogate, there was a degree of equivocation. The Japanese seized upon this and sought a new agreement since Hull intimated some "new consideration" for a treaty. Toward the close of the year, on December 20, 1939, he advised Ambassador Grew that the United States did not wish to enter into negotiation for a new treaty. As indicated earlier, Grew's position was well known then. In October, 1939, he stated it as follows: "In both my talks with the President I brought out clearly my view that if we once start sanctions against Japan we must see them through to the end, and the end may conceivably be war." After several months of absence from his post the Ambassador nevertheless expressed America's growing concern when, in an address to the American-Japan Society in Tokyo, he declared, "An effort is being made to establish control, in Japan's own interest, of large areas on the continent of Asia and to impose upon those areas a system of closed economy."²⁰

It is also important to note several other developments at this late hour. A survey of newspaper clippings for the period shows much publicity given to U.S. exports of iron and steel scrap to Japan. With allowances made for item classifications, many papers pointed out that in the years 1933-1941 the United States exported over 10 million tons of iron and steel scrap to Japan. Relying on Department of Commerce estimates at the time, we tabulated the exports for 1936-40 as follows: 1936—1,184,536 tons, 1937—2,140,889, 1938—1,547,617, 1939—2,279,315, 1940—1,079,141, or a total of 8,231,498 tons in this short period of time. Moreover, the Gallup Poll of the day indicated general public opposition to such exports.

Some areas of business also expressed their opposition to these exports. For example, on March 23, 1939, Mr. E. T. Weir, then chairman of the National Steel Corporation, urged a complete stoppage of these exports. The following year, when an embargo was finally ordered on the export of scrap steel, Mr. Weir openly declared on October 15, "It should have been done long ago. The exported scrap that has been permitted thus far has brought inventories of this vital resource to a point where they are dangerously low." On this issue, there was a sharp clash between Weir and Secretary of Interior Ickes when the United States was already in the heat of war with Japan, and accusations of blame and responsibility were rife. Countering the Secretary's accusation that the steel industry was to blame for shipping scrap iron to Japan, Weir demanded from Ickes a public retraction of the charge, maintaining, "It would be natural to expect you to help alibi the shameful record of the Roosevelt Administration which, by permitting the export of millions of tons of scrap steel to Japan, helped Japan prepare for its war against the United States."²¹ Obviously, whoever was to blame, the great wrong had been done.

TOO LATE, TOO LITTLE

Then, and in subsequent years, a favorite argument circulated about to the effect that severe economic restrictions by the United States alone would not have curbed aggressive Japanese designs and actions. In itself the argument is purely speculative, for the restrictions that were imposed came far too late and even then, as additional evidence reveals, they might at least have caused a Japanese withdrawal from China. Further-

¹¹ Ethel B. Dietrich, *Far Eastern Trade of the United States* (New York, 1940), p. 18.

¹² Bland Calder, *Japan Is a "Good" Cash Customer*, U.S. Department of Commerce, Special Report "E", June 8, 1938.

¹³ Edythe M. Garber, *Japan's Prewar Foreign Trade*, U.S. Department of Commerce, International Reference Service series, May, 1946, p. 1.

²⁰ "The Far East," address by the American Ambassador to Japan, *Department of State Bulletin*, November 11, 1939.

²¹ "Challenges Ickes on Scrap for Japan," *The New York Times*, November 2, 1944.

more, the argument clearly fails to exonerate us from the undoubtedly substantial contributions we made toward the practical advancement of these designs and aggressions.

Also, in view of our own behavior, it is almost gratuitous to point out the blatant absence of any serious attempt on our part to obtain a collective embargo against Japan. Nothing could be clearer in this respect than the British attitude toward American vacillation in the Far East. As one author discloses, "On September 13 Lothian had told Morgenthau that in view of the delicacy of the situation, neither the Dutch nor British could be expected to antagonize Japan by interfering with the flow of oil from the Indies, unless they were able to count on American support in the Far East."²² This fact was recorded in Secretary of Treasury Morgenthau's diary for September 13, 1940. Applying all this to the present situation, it can be reasonably argued that many are repeating the same argument in relation to East-West trade and are in the process of committing the same mistake.

From July 1940 on, the United States proceeded to tighten the economic strings on Japan. A succession of executive orders on licenses for exports ensued, though Secretary of State Hull continued to oppose suggestions for full-scale economic warfare. On July 2, Roosevelt signed the Export Control Act, authorizing the President to license or prohibit exports of essential defense material. By this act Roosevelt issued his first order that day, placing under license all arms and certain basic raw materials like aluminum, specified chemicals, aircraft parts, armor plate, glass, plastics, and machine tools. On July 25, he ordered the same for petroleum products, tetraethyl lead, iron and steel scrap. An instructive note here is that only two days before, General De Witt, who commanded the military forces on the Pacific Coast, had reported Japanese stockpiling of aviation gasoline and their signing of contracts with American companies for the delivery of 1,200,000 drums of gasoline.²³ Other Presidential orders followed in the remaining months of 1940 and into 1941, but their full application and effect were partly offset by the objections of Sumner Welles, Hull and others, who still felt that they would lead to war.

The war in Europe made Japan even more dependent on the United States, Japanese trade with Germany fell off. Exports to the United States, particularly Japanese raw silk, continued as an important source for Japan's acquisition of dollar balances for the purchase of materials here and elsewhere. According to a Department of Commerce study, in 1940 American exports to Japan of commodities under export license totaled about \$125 million.²⁴ As of February, 1941, the remainder of U.S. exports not under export control included raw cotton, a number of petroleum products, wood pulp, lumber, automobiles, auto parts, and so forth. Meanwhile, numerous memoranda were directed at Japan for interference with U.S. trade in China. For example, a note delivered by the American Ambassador in Japan to the Japanese Minister for Foreign Affairs stated the case as follows: "I have the honor to refer to the representations made by my Government to the Japanese Government on frequent occasions during the last three years regarding interference with American enterprise and trade in China by the local Japanese authorities, as well as by local regimes under Japanese control. . . . Abundant indications have appeared in the course of recent weeks that the Japanese military authorities intend to institute

similar controls over the very important trade of Shanghai."²⁵

Just a few months before Pearl Harbor and the outbreak of American-Japanese hostilities, Roosevelt issued several more executive orders designed to tighten the economic restrictions against Japan. For example, on July 26 he froze all Japanese assets in the United States. On August 1 another order was issued prohibiting exports of wood pulp, metals, manufacturing machinery, and vehicles. Despite the fact that many viewed such sanctions as posing a critical choice for Tokyo between retreat and resistance, Japan soon moved for satisfactory negotiations, even involving its withdrawal from China.²⁶ The United States proved to be indifferent to this move. The Konohe cabinet resigned on October 16. The succeeding Tojo government, though it also sought negotiations, was not prepared to yield easily.

Another illuminating analysis was made that year in the Department of Commerce.²⁷ Most appropriate to our present conditions regarding trade with Communist totalitarian regimes, the study in effect expanded the "strategic goods" concept to include supplies for food consumption, clothing, and housing requirements. It showed how substantial our contributions were in these respects. Japan was wholly dependent on cotton and wool imports which the United States supplied. We also supplied the fertilizing material for Japanese food production. And to the pronounced relief of Japanese industry and its necessary diversion of resources, U.S. exports met a good portion of the housing requirements. The analyst did not exaggerate when he stated, "The United States has for many years contributed more to the national economy of Japan than has any other nation."²⁸ He also concluded that as an importer the United States could have seriously disrupted Japan's war economy by denying it approximately \$135 million with an embargo on imports of silk, aquatic products, tea, toys, and other Japanese goods.

It is quite evident, then, that had we had a firm policy of economic restriction and embargo early in the 1930's, had we as a consequence allied others in this collective effort against imperialistic Japan, had political judgments been based on official economic studies in the executive area itself, the course of developments would have been radically different and war itself could have been staved off between the United States and Japan. This in turn could conceivably have produced entirely different results in Europe. "Generally," as one author puts it, "we failed to appreciate Japan's vulnerability to blockade and the extreme degree of her dependence on imported raw materials."²⁹ He goes on to show how we overestimated Japan's raw material reserves and emphasizes the "fact that Japan's productive machine had come virtually to a standstill by mid-1945 came as a major surprise to U.S. observers who surveyed the scene in Japan immediately after the surrender."³⁰ Progress toward such a standstill in the mid-30's was a real possibility.

Our experience with Japan leading up to Pearl Harbor is sufficient in and of itself to demonstrate the need for a sensible economic policy in dealing with aggressive, imperialistic powers. The irrationality of aiding such powers even in areas beyond the

arbitrary limits of "strategic good" definitions becomes more impressive as facts, such as the selected few given above, are carefully reviewed. But, as though this were not enough, the United States also made its economic contributions to the totalitarian economies of Germany and Italy.

UNITED STATES-AXIS TRADE EXTENDED

In the 1930's many observers had insight and foresight as to the road being traveled by Hitler and Mussolini. Looking at their records today, it becomes evident that U.S. economic policy was equally unsound in relation to the imperialist powers of Germany and Italy. To be sure, U.S. trade patterns were different in these two cases, and countries such as Great Britain and France could have had a more determinative effect on the two totalitarian European economies if an economic embargo had been imposed. However, if U.S. leadership had been the order of the day, which of course it was not, collective sanctions would have been enormously effective. As it turned out, in the cases of the German and Italian war economies we made our contributions to their development and to world disaster.

About a year and a half after Japan invaded Manchuria, Adolf Hitler became chancellor of Germany, and that country was directed along a new, aggressive course. To be well impressed by the patent discrepancy between that course and our economic relations with Nazified Germany, one should review the rapid succession of aggressive events leading to the outbreak of World War II in September, 1939: (a) 1933—Germany withdrew from the League of Nations, October 14; (b) 1934—with the death of von Hindenburg, on August 2 Hitler consolidated the offices of chancellor and president and became the Fuehrer; (c) 1935—Hitler rejected the Versailles Treaty and German military conscription was ordered on March 10; (d) 1936—March 7, German troops reoccupied the demilitarized Rhineland zone in violation of the Locarno Pact; on November 25, Japan and Germany signed an anti-Comintern pact, to which Italy joined the following year on November 6; (e) 1938—on March 11, Hitler invaded Austria and on September 30, after the Munich conference, he occupied the Sudetenland; and (f) 1939—September 1, Germany, aided by the Stalin pact, declared war on Poland, and World War II began.

From 1933 on, Hitlerian Germany's policy was geared to rearmament, growing self-sufficiency, expansionism, and war. These formed the props of Germany's international economic relations. As one scholar assessed part of the pattern, "Payments made under the civil public works programs were large, but they were nothing compared with the enormous expenditures incident to the rearmament program."³¹ Taking just the period of 1933-36, he added, "Therefore practically the whole of the increase in employment and investment over 1932 has been due to rearmament, strategic roads, and stimulus to industries which are of military importance." The German economic upswing after 1934 was abnormal, as "producers' investment goods," automobiles, and building construction rose violently but current consumption goods remained practically stationary. In the words of another close analyst, "The main line of policy adopted by the government was simple: to channel the increase of production primarily into those industries that were important for the realization of military goals."³²

Confronted by raw material shortages,

³¹ Kenyon E. Poole, *German Financial Policies 1932-1939* (Cambridge, 1939), pp. 100-101.

³² Arthur Schweitzer, *Big Business in the Third Reich* (Bloomington, Ind., 1964), p. 335.

²² Feis, *op. cit.*, p. 103.

²³ Kubek, *op. cit.*, pp. 185-186.

²⁴ Victoria C. Hungerford, *op. cit.*

²⁵ *Papers Relating to the Foreign Relations of the United States, Japan: 1931-1941, (1943), II, 883-884.*

²⁶ Kubek, *op. cit.*, p. 277.

²⁷ Halleck A. Butts, *Effect on Japan's Economy of an American Embargo on Exports to Japan*, U.S. Department of Commerce, February 26, 1941.

²⁸ *Ibid.*, p. 28.

²⁹ Cohen, *op. cit.*, p. 48.

³⁰ *Ibid.*, p. 49.

Germany resorted to all sorts of economic manipulations, including extensive bartering, ersatz substitute development, and selective importation, such as seen in the Communist Empire today. Normal foreign trade did not harmonize with a planned war economy. An observer at the time reported accurately when he said, "Yet, the barter system has found recognition and admiration even in the United States."³³ Analyses of reports by German industrial leaders reveal conclusively that Germany could not win a major war because of raw material dependence and relatively low stockpiles.³⁴ On the basis of this, if there had been an Allied embargo early in the period, it would certainly have deeply affected Hitler's war plans. Significant comparisons between Germany's economic posture prior to 1914 and that before 1939 reveal severe shortages in the latter period that Goering's Four Year Plan was supposed to have overcome.³⁵ Ersatz production, e.g., producing oil from coal, was another technique used in the plan, and so was the process of selective importation. It is here that the American contribution was made.

This part of the story is well summarized in a paragraph of a very instructive analysis of the period:

Many raw materials which are scarce in Germany are being imported in greater quantities than at any time before. During 1929, a year of prosperity, when barter trade was unknown, German industry had reached a high level of production. Yet in 1938 Germany had a net import of 30% more iron ore than in 1929, 143% more lead ore, 330% more chrome ore, 50% more copper ore, 140% more nickel ore, 26% more flax, 76% more hemp, and so on. The greater part of these raw material imports is needed for armaments.³⁶

The author presents aggregate statistics of raw material imports gathered from official German sources.

On the basis of statistical data furnished by our own Department of Commerce, it is clear that certain U.S. exports to Nazi Germany in the period of 1933-39 inclusive contributed to the German war machine. They disclose many illuminating facts frequently associated with our trade with Japan but not with Germany. For many of these vital commodities the cumulation of German imports from the United States reached sizable amounts.

Germany ranked high in imports of certain goods exported by us; (a) it ranked high in U.S. exports of gas oil and distillate fuel oil, \$1.1 million in 1935, \$3.5 million in 1936, \$4.4 million in 1937, and \$6.3 million in 1938; (b) it ranked third in U.S. exports of lubricating oil, red and pale, \$3.4 million in 1937, \$2.7 million in 1938, \$2.0 million in 1939; (c) it was second in imports of U.S. lubricating oil, cylinder, bright stocks, \$3.4 million in 1937, \$3.3 million in 1938, and \$2.4 million in 1939; (d) it was second, after Great Britain, in imports of U.S. lubricating oil, refined stocks, \$1.1 million in 1937, \$0.8 million in 1938, and \$0.6 million in 1939; (e) in 1937-38 it was first in imports of miscellaneous U.S. lubricating oils, \$1.4 million in 1937, \$1.7 million in 1938, \$1.1 million in 1939; (f) German imports of U.S. aluminum ingots, scrap and alloys were \$1.2 million in 1937, \$1.7 million in 1938, \$2.0 million in 1939; (g) Germany was top importer of U.S. rubber scrap in 1937 with 28.9 million pounds and second to Japan with 10.1 million in 1938; (h) it ranked high in imports of U.S.

refined copper, with 75.0 million pounds in 1937, 148.6 million in 1938, and 42.5 million in 1939; (i) and for imports of U.S. old and scrap copper, Germany outranked Japan in 1937 with 23.7 million pounds, or more than 50% of total U.S. export, 23.6 million or over 50% in 1938, and 11.0 million or about 40% in 1939.

Turning now to Mussolini's Italy, it is well to bear in mind that Mussolini began to flex his muscles in 1935 with the invasion of Ethiopia on October 2; he joined the Anti-Comintern Pact in November, 1937, and the following month, on December 11, Italy gave notice of withdrawal from the League of Nations; in 1938-39, Italy was in effect an Axis partner. Though on a lower level of economic power, Italy displayed all the characteristic signs of an aggressive totalitarian economy—self-sufficiency, armed strength, and controlled trade. Pertinent to our subject, an Italian fascist publication states it as follows: "In carrying out the commercial policies outlined above the Government avails itself of the organized forces of the Totalitarian State. Thus imports of staples essential to national defense—solid and liquid fuels, iron ore and scrap, non-ferrous ores and metals—are made through special semi-official bodies. . . ." Some of these items came in substantial amounts from the United States.

Not generally known is the fact that U.S. foreign economic policy in the 1930's contributed not only to Italy's war economy but also to the undermining of collective sanctions against Italian exports after the invasion of Ethiopia. Economic sanctions went into effect in November, 1935, supported by 52 members of the League of Nations and one non-member, Egypt. They ceased purchases of Italian goods and naturally restricted exports to Italy. "Although it is true," writes one keen analyst, "that while sanctions lasted they failed to achieve their objective, the damage done by them to Italy's international economic position was, nevertheless, considerable."³⁷ He also points out, "It is interesting to note . . . that during sanctions non-sanctionist countries bought 88.7% of Italy's total exports (37% of this going to Germany and 17% to the United States) and sold her 66.4% of her total imports (29% being sold by Germany and 13% by the United States). These figures show clearly that, had Italy not had the support of the non-sanctionist countries (the trade with whom amounted, even before the sanctions, to about 48% of her total foreign commerce), her foreign trade would in all probability have been completely paralyzed by the sanctionist measures."³⁸

As in the case of Germany, a detailed commodity-by-commodity breakdown based on Department of Commerce data shows the strategic materials the United States was shipping to the Italian war economy during this whole prelude to war and even after the outbreak of World War II. From a cumulative, summational viewpoint, these values aggregate substantially over the years. As examples: (a) in 1937 Italy imported 0.2 million tons of U.S. old and scrap copper, in 1938 the figure jumped to 2.6 million tons, and in 1939, 3.9 million tons; (b) in 1939, U.S. exports of ferro-alloy ores to Italy amounted to \$580,749; in 1940 after the outbreak of World War II they increased to \$865,130; (c) Italy lagged behind top-importing Japan in U.S. refined copper exports but surpassed Germany in 1939, importing 41.6 million tons in 1937, 43.7 million tons in 1938, and 56.0 million tons in 1939; (d) Italy's imports of U.S. iron and steel scrap were less than 10% of total U.S. exports in 1937—

381,000 tons—but in both 1938-39, they exceeded this percentage, with 435,000 tons in 1938 and 426,000 tons in 1939; (e) similar comparisons and the same tendency apply to Italian imports of U.S. residual fuel oil (257,000 barrels in 1937, 1,201,000 in 1938, and 1,402,000 in 1939) and lubricating oil (28,000 barrels in 1937, 30,000 in 1938, and 68,000 in 1939). And as in the two other cases these are only a few examples.

A CONCLUSION

The lessons of our experiences with aggressive powers before World War II must be understood more than ever now. The totalitarian Communist Empire is a far more insidious and sinister enemy than were any of our World War II adversaries. In the nebulous context of the Cold War the nature of a strategic good far surpasses what was construed as such in the 1930's. The lessons learned then should be firm guidelines for our trade policy toward the Communist Empire now.

ADDITIONAL HIGHWAY SEGMENTS NEED TO BE ADDED TO THE INTERSTATE SYSTEM THIS CONGRESS

Mr. ARENDS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Florida [Mr. CRAMER] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. CRAMER. Mr. Speaker, I have introduced two bills today, which, if enacted, would provide for the designation of two important highway segments in the State of Florida as parts of the National System of Interstate and Defense Highways. Since the designation of the 41,000 miles of highway routes in 1956 for the Interstate System, it has become increasingly evident that certain links and segments in the national network of multi-laned, limited-access, interstate highways do need to be added to the presently authorized mileage of 41,000 miles on that Interstate System.

Section 3 of the Federal-Aid Highway Act of 1965, Public Law 89-139, requires the Secretary of Transportation, inasmuch as the functions of the Bureau of Public Roads were transferred last year from the Department of Commerce to the Department of Transportation, to report to Congress in January 1968, and in January of every second year thereafter, his estimates of the future highway needs of the Nation. I introduced a resolution and cosponsored the effort to enact this particular requirement so that there would be an orderly development of the Federal-aid highway programs after 1972 when the then-authorized Interstate System authorizations would expire.

The Committee on Public Works, on which I have the privilege of serving as the ranking minority member, made it clear in its report accompanying the legislation which was to become the Federal-Aid Highway Act of 1965 that the committee expected the January 1968 study of future highway needs to include specific route designations for any proposed increases in mileage on the Interstate System. Missing links and seg-

³³ Karl Robert, *Hitler's Counterfeit Reich* (New York, 1941), p. 77.

³⁴ Louis P. Lochner, *Tycoons and Tyrants* (Chicago, 1954), pp. 191-197.

³⁵ Fritz Sternberg, *From Nazi Sources: Why Hitler Can't Win* (New York, 1939), pp. 87-100.

³⁶ Guenter Reimann, *The Vampire Economy* (New York, 1939), pp. 53-54.

³⁷ *Fascist Era, Year XVIII, Fascist Confederation of Industrialists* (Rome, 1939), p. 119.

³⁸ William G. Welk, *Fascist Economic Policy* (Cambridge, 1938), p. 176.

³⁹ *Ibid.*, p. 211.

ments of highways, such as those which I have proposed to be included as part of the Interstate System in my bills today, should definitely be included in any additional authorizations recommended by the administration and enacted by the Congress.

The first of the bills which I introduced today provides for the construction of an interstate highway from the Interstate 75 terminus at Tampa, Fla., and from the Interstate 4 terminus at St. Petersburg, Fla., through Bradenton, Sarasota, Venice, Punta Gorda, Fort Myers, Naples, and Miami, to Fort Lauderdale and Homestead. In my judgment, this missing link is one of the most obvious inadequacies in the Interstate System. There is no interstate route whatsoever linking the west coast of Florida with the lower east coast area, despite the fact that the west coast would be the shortest route from many Midwestern and Eastern cities to the Fort Lauderdale-Miami area. In addition, the west coast of Florida is one of the fastest growing areas of the entire Nation. Interstate 75, which links such populated areas as Atlanta, Birmingham, Chattanooga, St. Louis, New Orleans, Dallas, and Chicago, with the west coast of Florida, presently deadends in Tampa. Interstate 4, which links many populous areas of the eastern United States to the Tampa-St. Petersburg-Clearwater area presently deadends in St. Petersburg. I therefore feel it essential that a new interstate highway be constructed so that the interstate traffic presently terminating in the Tampa-St. Petersburg area can be funneled down the lower west coast to the Fort Lauderdale-Miami area.

The second bill which I have introduced today would provide for the construction of an interstate highway between Interstate 65 in the vicinity of Montgomery, Ala., to the vicinity of Ocala, Fla., through Tallahassee, Fla. This highway would accommodate the large volumes of traffic from the Alabama, Tennessee, Kentucky, Ohio, Michigan, Indiana, and Illinois areas southeasterly from Montgomery to Interstate 10 in the vicinity of Marianna, on I-10 to Tallahassee and thence southeasterly to Ocala where the proposed extension would connect with Interstate 75 to Tampa-St. Petersburg and the Sunshine State Parkway to Miami. It is through the panhandle section of Florida that families travel by car from the great southwestern part of the United States. I believe that an interstate highway from Montgomery to the vicinity of Tallahassee and thence to Ocala is warranted and in the best interests of the motoring public.

I would expect that the routes designated by my two bills will be included as proposed additions to the Interstate System in the "after 72" study of future highway needs presently underway. I shall continue to press for their inclusion and subsequent enactment.

TOLL FACILITIES ON THE INTERSTATE HIGHWAY SYSTEM

Mr. ARENDS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Florida [Mr. CRAMER] may extend

his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. CRAMER. Mr. Speaker, the relationship of toll facilities to the Federal-aid highway programs, particularly the National System of Interstate and Defense Highways program, has been a matter of concern to me for a number of years.

One of my major concerns has been the fact that under existing law the Federal Highway Administrator does not even have to be consulted about the construction of a toll facility—a toll road, bridge, or tunnel—upon the route of a Federal-aid highway, including one on the Interstate System, unless Federal-aid highway funds have been expended on the section of the highway involved.

In 1961, during the first session of the 87th Congress, I learned that certain actions, and certain proposed actions concerning the Sunshine State Parkway in my own State of Florida were having an adverse impact on the interstate program in the State. At that time I introduced two bills: one to require congressional approval of the designation of toll roads as part of the Interstate System; and the other to prevent the possible abandonment of Interstate Route I-95 between Fort Pierce, Fla., and Daytona Beach, Fla., as a result of an extension of the Sunshine State Parkway which parallels it.

Hearings on the two bills were held by the Committee on Public Works; and although neither bill was enacted into law, the hearings served to pinpoint problems which exist, not only in Florida but in many other States as well, regarding the relationship between toll facilities and the Federal-aid highway systems.

On October 5, 1962, on the occasion of inserting in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD considerable factual data concerning "toll traps" and the effect of toll roads on the Federal-aid highway systems, I commented:

A careful and searching congressional review of this problem is long overdue. Under these circumstances, I feel that the Committee on Public Works of the House of Representatives should undertake a detailed investigation of the entire subject of toll facilities on the routes of the Federal-aid highway system. As a member of that committee, I intend to press vigorously for such an investigation.

The committee members began to agree with me more and more that public hearings were badly needed on this complex problem. As problems arose throughout the Nation from the location of toll facilities on the Federal-aid highway systems, the cries for detailed hearings increased.

Last spring, the Special Subcommittee on the Federal-Aid Highway Program and the legislative Subcommittee on Roads, both of which are subcommittees of the Committee on Public Works, held 17 days of public hearings on the relationship of toll facilities to the Federal-aid highway programs. Those hearings were exactly the kind of hearings I envisioned in 1962 when I called for a de-

tailed investigation and careful, searching congressional review of the entire subject of toll facilities on the routes of the Federal-aid highway systems. The testimony we heard, which numbers some 944 printed pages, showed conclusively the need for corrective legislation concerning several aspects of this matter.

The fact that under existing law the Federal Highway Administrator does not even have to be consulted about the construction of a toll facility upon the route of a Federal-aid highway, including one on the Interstate System, unless Federal-aid highway funds have been expended on the highway section involved was graphically illustrated during these hearings by the disclosure that the construction of Interstate Route 95 in Georgia as a toll road was being seriously considered and by the disclosure that the Boston extension of the Massachusetts Turnpike was actually constructed as a toll road when it could have been constructed as a toll-free road with the Federal Government paying 90 percent of the cost. In my opinion, these examples serve to further emphasize the need for legislation such as that embodied in the bill which I have introduced today.

There is another serious matter in this area which I would like to call to the attention of the House. I am very troubled because of the lack of any clear understanding of the meaning and effect of the agreements entered into under section 129(d) of title 23 of the United States Code dealing with toll road approaches. The Bureau of Public Roads interprets these agreements in one way, while in some cases the State highway departments and toll authorities interpret them in an entirely different way. The committee heard witnesses who have entered into such agreements and who readily admit that they did not understand the Bureau's position relative to the limitations imposed upon them by the agreements. It seems obvious to me that when public officials enter into an agreement, particularly one involving the expenditure of large sums of money, limiting the construction of urgently needed highway improvements, and affecting the vested rights of bondholders and many others, the officials are delinquent in their duties if they do not have a clear and precise understanding—a true meeting of the minds—as to exactly what rights, obligations, and responsibilities are created by the agreement.

Mr. Speaker, since I first introduced legislation concerning toll facilities in 1961, a total of 798 miles of new toll highway facilities were opened to traffic in the United States through 1965. We can expect many more miles of toll facilities, particularly if the Congress does not take early action to solve the financial problems confronting the Federal-aid highway program and to complete the Interstate System at a reasonably early date. Under these circumstances, it is essential that Federal laws and policies provide for effective and rational coordination of toll-free highway facilities.

I am satisfied that the hearings provided the committee with detailed information which will enable it to devise clarifying, corrective legislation at the earliest possible date.

Toward such an end, Mr. Speaker, I have introduced a bill today to amend section 129(b) of title 23 of the United States Code, which bill, if enacted, will clarify this situation. The bill which I introduced today is identical to my bill, H.R. 11685, of the last Congress. The text of the bill reads as follows:

H.R. 2304

A bill to amend section 129(b) of title 23, United States Code, relating to toll roads, bridges, and tunnels on the National System of Interstate and Defense Highways

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That subsection (b) of section 129, United States Code, is amended by adding the following material after the last sentence of the subsection: "After the date of enactment of this Act, all agreements between the Secretary and a State highway department for the construction of projects on the Interstate System shall contain a clause providing that no toll road, bridge, or tunnel will be constructed on the interstate highway route involved without the official concurrence of the Secretary. The Secretary shall not concur in any such construction unless he shall affirmatively find that, under the particular circumstances existing the construction of such road, bridge, or tunnel as a toll facility rather than a toll-free facility is in the public interest."

CANAL ZONE SURRENDER AND PANAMA CANAL GIVEAWAY MUST BE BLOCKED

The SPEAKER. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. Gross], is recognized for 30 minutes.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Iowa?

There was no objection.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, one of the gravest policy questions with which I have been associated for a number of years is that of the Panama Canal where U.S. treaty-based sovereignty over the Canal Zone now stands imperiled because of a series of blunders that are worse than crimes. It is important, especially for new Members of the Congress, to know that the present crisis affecting the Panama Canal enterprise was not suddenly thrust upon us but that it has a long history.

When the question of the formal display of the Panama flag in the Canal Zone first came up following anti-U.S. riots in Panama, the subject was studied at length by the House Committee on Foreign Affairs, which reported out House Concurrent Resolution 459, 86th Congress, in opposition to such display. On February 2, 1960, after considerable debate, the House adopted this resolution by the overwhelming vote of 381 to 12.

Seven days later, on February 9, this body unanimously agreed to an amendment, introduced by myself, to the 1961 appropriations bill for the Department of Commerce and related agencies. This measure provided that:

No part of any appropriation contained in title II of this act shall be used to construct

a flag pole, platform, or any other device for the purpose of displaying the flag of Panama in the Canal Zone, the sovereign control of which is vested in the United States Government by virtue of long standing treaty.

What happened? In the Senate, House Concurrent Resolution 459, because of opposition of the Department of State, was pigeonholed in the Committee of Foreign Relations. The Senate, however, when given an opportunity to vote on the amended appropriation bill, passed it unanimously. Thus, the amendment became law.

As predicted on the floor of the House near the close of that session by my distinguished colleague the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. Flood], soon after the Congress adjourned and in total disregard of the formally expressed intent of the Congress, the then President of the United States on September 17, 1960, authorized the display of one Panama flag at Shaler Triangle in the Canal Zone. Apparently this action was taken on the recommendations of his brother, Dr. Milton Eisenhower, and the Department of State that such token recognition would beguile Panamanian leaders from their radical demands.

Since that time succeeding Presidents have extended the number of Panamanian flags displayed in the zone, thereby giving full credence to extreme Panamanian claims of full sovereignty over the zone, which is now in a condition of chaos.

Unfortunately, the mass news media of our country, apparently dominated by the White House and State Department, has not only failed to present the Canal Zone sovereignty issue but also has declined to publish vital facts. These, if known by our people, would present the giveaway of the Canal Zone and canal under present administrative plans.

The facts incident to the current canal treaty negotiations have been wholly suppressed in Panama by the Panamanian Government and every attempt has been made by our own Government to assure a similar condition of affairs in the United States. Thus we have in both countries the tragedy of silence, and this on one of the gravest questions in diplomatic history.

Our Department of State, sad to relate, has long been—and is now—timid, servile, weak, obsequious, unmindful of the best interests of the United States, and altogether indifferent to our just and indispensable rights, power, and authority over the canal enterprise, which are vital for the protection of the free world.

The result is that the conspirators in Panama and their collaborators in the executive branch of our Government have been able to advance the long-range Red program for undermining our legal position in the Canal Zone virtually unopposed.

Flying the first Panamanian flag on the U.S. Canal Zone territory in 1960 was the thrust of the camel's nose into the tent and now, through the process of piecemeal erosions, the whole body of the brute is almost within the tent. If the new treaties now being negotiated are ratified that means that the entire body will be enclosed.

Fortunately, some of the Nation's most gifted publicists have been able to obtain a knowledge of the situation and thus to oppose what is taking place at Panama and in Washington.

In the November 7 and 14, 1966, issues of the Dan Smoot Report are two admirable articles on the Panama Canal situation by Dan Smoot, one of our best informed and most fearless commentators on public events. In these, he summarizes the preparations for the giveaway at Panama now in process and the plan to haul down the U.S. flag.

Mr. Speaker, because of the managed news procedures that now feature the operations of our Government, special attention is invited to the revealing description in the November 14 article of the atrocities committed during the January 1964 riots in which five Americans are reported as having been hanged. Although there have long been rumors of atrocities against U.S. citizens in Panama during the January 1964 mob attacks on the Canal Zone, we do not yet know the extent of them because of the controlled press and the silence imposed by the two governments.

During the last decade, the conduct of our Isthmian Canal policies has, indeed, been tragically inept. For those who wish to obtain authentic information, the scholarly and splendidly documented addresses and statements in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD by the gentleman from Pennsylvania, Representative DANIEL J. FLOOD, are an unsurpassed source of information. An assembly of his significant contributions, 1958-66, pursuant to a House Concurrent Resolution 925, 89th Congress, unanimously adopted by both Houses, was published in one volume as House Document No. 474 under the title of "Isthmian Canal Policy Questions," and has been distributed to all Members of the Congress.

Because of the pertinence and timeliness of the two previously mentioned articles by Dan Smoot, I shall quote both as parts of my remarks and commend them for reading by all concerned with the canal question. Also I urge citizens of our country, in and out of this body, to write their views on the canal treaty question to Members of the Senate as recommended by Dan Smoot. Only an aroused public sentiment can prevent the un-American and pusillanimous attempt by the executive branch of our Government to surrender its indispensable authority with respect to the Canal Zone and Panama Canal.

The two indicated articles by Dan Smoot follow:

[From the Dan Smoot Report, Dallas, Tex., Nov. 7, 1966]

PREPARATION FOR THE PANAMA GIVEAWAY

On October 7, 1966, the foreign minister of Panama said that talks with U.S. negotiators are well on the way toward an agreement to abrogate the treaty of 1903.¹

The importance of that statement is incalculable. President Johnson—sacrificing American lives in Vietnam under pretext of fighting communism and protecting American security interests—is preparing to

¹ "New Canal Treaty Said Well Along," by Sam Pope Brewer, *The Dallas Morning News*, October 8, 1966, p. A3.

surrender vital American interests to Panama, in compliance with demands which Communists have been making for years.²

The Panama Canal Zone is United States territory as clearly and completely as the city of Washington is. President Johnson has no more right to grant Panama sovereignty over our Canal Zone than to cede the State of Alaska to the Soviet Union.³

The current talks which are "well on the way" toward our final surrender in Panama have been going on since April 1964. Piece-meal surrender, for the purpose of appeasing Communists and other agitators, has been going on since the days of Franklin D. Roosevelt.

It is a twice-told tale which needs to be told again.

Prior to 1903, the Isthmus of Panama was a province of Colombia. The revolution which separated Panama from Colombia was promoted by a New York lawyer and five ambitious men in Panama, three of whom were United States citizens. This group, backed by the United States Government, created the nation of Panama in 1903.⁴

At that time, Panama (a land of chronic political instability, owned by a few wealthy families) was the pesthole of the world. Virulent tropical diseases had to be conquered before we could wrench worthless land from the voracious jaws of a steaming jungle and convert it into a mighty waterway to lift ships over the bedrock of the continental divide. Many American lives and millions of American tax dollars went into that dual miracle of sanitation and engineering.⁵

The Republic of Panama was not a partner in the Panama Canal enterprise; she was the principal beneficiary.

In our 1903 treaty with the new Republic of Panama, we bought the Panama Canal Zone—a ten-mile-wide strip across the Isthmus, from the Atlantic to the Pacific—for 10 million dollars plus an annuity. The annuity was not a lease or rental fee; it was a guarantee of revenue to keep the Panama government alive. We acquired full ownership and sovereignty, by grant in perpetuity, making the Canal Zone United States territory forever.⁶

When Roosevelt extended diplomatic recognition to the Soviet Union in 1933, he gave a boost to communist activity throughout the world. Most Latin American nations followed Roosevelt's lead in recognizing the lawless Kremlin gang as a lawful government. Communist agitators who had been operating illegally, came out in the open with their "yankee imperialism" propaganda; and many became successful politicians.

The ground swell of anti-United States propaganda, which developed south of the border after our recognition of the Soviet Union, was one reason for F.D.R.'s "good neighbor" policy in Latin America. F.D.R. presented his "good neighbor" policy in a way which implied that the United States had formerly been a bad neighbor. This encouraged more anti-United States activity until everyone, north and south, was ready for us to "make amends" for past behavior.

The most important consequence was a renegotiation of our treaty agreements with Panama. In the Hull-Alfaro Treaty (signed March 2, 1936, but not ratified by the U.S. Senate until July 25, 1939), the United States raised annuity payments to Panama from 250 thousand dollars to 430 thousand, to compensate for the 40% loss in purchasing power of the dollar which had resulted from Roosevelt's taking us off the gold standard in 1934. This concession was reasonable.⁷

In the 1936-39 treaty, we renounced the 1903 treaty provision which made Panama a protectorate of the United States; and we renounced our right to maintain public order

in Panama, outside of the Canal Zone. These concessions were incongruous, because we must protect Panama from anarchy as long as we maintain and defend the Canal. Now we have the responsibility without clear treaty authority.⁸

The most harmful concessions Roosevelt made in the treaty of 1936-39 were: (1) renunciation of our right of eminent domain for the acquisition of property, in Colon and Panama City, needed for canal purposes; and (2) renunciation of our right to build defense bases in Panama outside the ten-mile Canal Zone. Roosevelt's treaty of 1936-39 left us with the responsibility of defending the Canal Zone—for ourselves, Panama, and every other maritime nation—but with no room to stand and fight. In less than two months after the treaty was ratified in 1939, World War II began in Europe; and we were begging Panama for defense sites to protect the Canal. We had to pay heavily for 134 base-sites which had been ours under the 1903 treaty provisions.⁹

Before the guns of World War II were silent, Panama was demanding evacuation of American bases, and more changes in U.S.-Panama treaties. President Truman evacuated most of the bases and gave them to Panama. President Eisenhower, his first year in office, sent a team to change the treaties.¹⁰

The result was the Eisenhower-Remon Treaty of 1955, in which the United States: (1) increased annuity payments from \$430 thousand to \$1.93 million; (2) gave Panama land and other properties—including the Panama Railroad Company's yards and terminal stations in the cities of Colon and Panama; (3) promised to build a \$27 million bridge across the Canal on the Pacific side. The only thing Panama gave us in the 1955 treaty was the right to use, for 15 years, the Rio Hato Air Base—which we had built for World War II and had given to Panama in 1948.¹¹

The American property which Eisenhower gave Panama (valued at about \$20 million) quickly deteriorated into uselessness.¹² Before 1955, the United States, in order to enforce sanitation rules necessary to public health in Panama, collected garbage in the cities of Colon and Panama. Panamanians considered this service an affront to their national dignity. We permitted them to collect their own garbage—and Colon and Panama became filthy places, their streets littered with refuse.

As soon as the 1955 treaty was ratified, Panama started agitating for more concessions—specifically for recognition of Panama sovereignty in the Canal Zone and for 50% of gross revenue from the Canal. Gross revenue from the Canal is about \$43 million a year; net revenue is less than \$3 million. Panama—with no investment, or responsibility for operating, maintaining, defending the Canal—gets, in annuity alone, more than half of net revenues. Corollary benefits of Canal operations are the very life blood of Panama's economy.

In May, 1958, mobs of Panama "students," incited and led by communists, demonstrated for "Panama sovereignty in the Canal Zone" by invading the U.S. Zone and planting 70 Panama flags. U.S. authorities removed the flags and gave them to the Panama government. Riots in Panama ensued, and lasted some 3 weeks. Our State Department tried to appease Panamanians: by announcing that Dr. Milton Eisenhower would soon visit Panama on a "good-will" trip.¹³

On November 3, 1959, Panama mobs again demonstrated for Panama sovereignty by invading our Canal Zone to plant the Panama flag. They also pulled down the American flag at the U.S. Embassy in Panama, mutilated it, and hoisted the Panama flag. During the day, 82 people were injured. Some of the injured were American soldiers who had been pelted with rocks. The mobs

were led by communists and prominent Panama politicians who apparently had the sanction of the Panama government, which had ordered Panama police to stay away from the scenes of violence.¹⁴

Our State Department tried to appease Panamanians by ordering U.S. Embassy personnel in Panama to "curtail" the flying of the American flag in front of our Embassy. Eisenhower tried to appease them by announcing that Panama does have "titular sovereignty" over the Canal Zone.¹⁵

Congress reacted angrily to Eisenhower's announcement. On February 2, 1960, the House passed a Resolution (381 to 12) which in essence, said that we should not permit the flag of Panama to be flown in our Canal Zone. On February 9, 1960, the House, in an amendment to an appropriations bill, prohibited the expenditure of tax money for any flagpole to fly Panama's flag in our Zone. On September 17, 1960, (after Congress, had adjourned) Eisenhower, defying Congress, ordered the flag of Panama to be flown at key places in the U.S. Canal Zone to demonstrate Panama's "titular sovereignty" over the whole Zone.

On October 25, 1960, Senator John F. Kennedy expressed approval of Eisenhower's action, but said it should have been taken 18 months earlier.¹⁶

On June 15, 1962, President Kennedy and President Chiari of Panama signed a secret memorandum agreeing to renegotiate the 1903 treaty.¹⁷

On October 12, 1962, the Thatcher Ferry Bridge at Balboa (which the U.S. had promised in the 1955 treaty) was dedicated. During the ceremonies, a riot erupted, and a Panama mob desecrated the American flag.¹⁸

On October 29, 1962, President Kennedy ordered the raising of the Panama flag at the American Canal Zone Administration Building.¹⁹

On January 10, 1963, the State Department announced that the United States had agreed: (1) to permit the Panama flag to be flown with the U.S. flag anywhere in the Canal Zone; (2) to recognize Panama's sovereign right to issue papers of authorization (exequaturs) to foreign consuls operating in the Canal Zone; (3) to use Panama postage in the Canal Zone; (4) to grant Panamanians in the Canal Zone opportunities and privileges equal to those of U.S. citizens, including U.S. Social Security benefits.²⁰

On July 23, 1963, the State Department announced another agreement conferring more benefits and concessions on Panamanians employed in the Canal Zone. On October 29, 1963, the Panama government announced official arrangements for Panama Independence Day parades, inside the Canal Zone. On November 5, 1963, the City Council of Panama held an official Council meeting on the steps of the United States District Court House in the Canal Zone.²¹

In December, 1963, the American Canal Zone Governor (Robert J. Fleming, Jr.) ordered that the U.S. flag could no longer be flown at the U.S. Court House or at American schools in the Canal Zone. Americans were even ordered not to fly the American flag at the Gamboa War Memorial inside the Canal Zone—a memorial to American soldiers who died in World War II.²²

On January 7, 1964, American students raised the American flag at the American Balboa High School in the American Zone. The principal and a Canal Zone official took the flag down. The students raised another

² "U.S. Giving Up Canal; Agrees to Scrap Panama Pact, Write New One," *Chicago Tribune*, September 25, 1965, pp. 1, 2.

³ "The Panama Canal—It Must Remain American," by Dr. Charles Callan Tansill (Committee on Pan-American Policy, 60 East 42nd Street, New York, New York 10017; price: 15¢), 12 pp.

⁴ "Panama—Part I," and "Panama—Part II," *The Dan Smoot Report*, January 20 and 27, 1964, pp. 17-32 (1 copy for 25¢, 6 for \$1.00).

flag, and gave the pledge of allegiance. Officials announced that the flagpole would be removed. Students kept raising the American flag each morning, taking it down at night, and keeping vigil over the flagpole to prevent its removal.²

On January 9, 1964, mobs of Panamanians rioted to protest the flying of the American flag at Balboa High School. The riots spread throughout Panama and the American Canal Zone. When they ended on January 13, an immense amount of American property had been destroyed or damaged. Twenty-one people were dead (including 4 American soldiers), and 300 injured.³

Present negotiations, already "well on the way" toward total surrender of American sovereignty in the Canal Zone, were initiated by President Johnson as a result of the 1964 riots.

[From the Dan Smoot Report, Dallas, Tex., Nov. 1, 1966]

OUR FLAG IS COMING DOWN IN PANAMA

Present U.S.-Panama negotiations of a new treaty (to meet demands of Panama politicians and of international communism that the U.S. surrender sovereignty over the Panama Canal Zone) were initiated by President Johnson as a result of the bloody Panama riots in January, 1964. Those riots were precipitated by Panama mobs protesting because American students raised an American flag, at an American high school, in the American Canal Zone. Here are excerpts from a contemporary log kept by a La Crosse, Wisconsin, radio commentator who was in Panama as a tourist at the time of the riots:

"The Canal Zone radio went off the air at 11 last night. . . . The radio announcers [on Panama stations outside the American Canal Zone] are screaming at the top of their lungs . . . 'to kill all the Americans you see.' Thelma King, a deputado (congress-woman) and Communist, screaming for two hours on the radio and loudspeakers in the city—to hunt out all the Americans and butcher them in the streets. . . .

"All kinds of armament . . . in the hands of the mob: pistols, clubs, Molotov cocktails. . . . Snipers previously posted on the surrounding rooftops . . . [firing] with rifles at the [American Canal Zone] police. . . . The looters . . . running in mobs . . . looking in the streets and in windows for Americans to kill. . . .

"Then they attacked the U. S. Embassy. We . . . phoned there, and were told to hang up as they were busy evacuating. So, there we were—no protection, and it appeared the U. S. didn't give a damn about us. . . .

"A show of force any time during this anti-American Red-inspired riot would have brought a quick end . . . and saved how many American lives? How many Americans are now dead in their apartments, or torn to pieces and hacked to bits? How many are dead in the outside villages hanging from trees and lamp posts? How many? . . . We know for sure the Panamanians hanged five Americans. Cut one more up in little pieces with machetes. This news . . . has been classified as secret and the . . . classifying is being done by our own government. . . ."

All fighting in which Americans were involved occurred inside our Canal Zone where American troops were trying to protect American lives and American property from foreign mobs which had invaded American soil. Nonetheless, the Panama President accused the United States of "aggression," and broke diplomatic relations saying he would not resume relations until the U.S. promised to renegotiate U.S.-Panama treaties.

¹ "La Crosse Man, Caught in Panama Riots, Writes Home," by Don Athnos, *The La Crosse Tribune*, January 30, 1964, p. 1 and the editorial page.

President Johnson said he would not yield to force and that violence was no basis for talks; yet, he rushed Thomas Mann to Panama for talks. On January 23, 1964, Johnson made an appeal for Panama to restore diplomatic relations with us, promising to discuss or renegotiate anything. Commenting on the riots, Johnson placed as much blame on American youngsters who had raised an American flag as on communist-led Panama mobs who had murdered, vandalized, and pillaged for more than a week.²

On March 21, 1964, Johnson sent Panama another conciliatory message re-emphasizing his willingness to discuss anything desired by Panama.

On April 3, 1964, Johnson resumed diplomatic relations with Panama—on Panama's terms—and began negotiations for "prompt elimination of the causes of conflict between the two countries, without limitations or preconditions of any kind."³

On April 5, 1964, when General Douglas MacArthur died, the American and Panama flags were lowered to half-mast in our Canal Zone. A few Panama "students" objected. The U.S. State Department, on orders from Johnson, had the Panama flag raised to full staff, above the American flag—in defiance of American military regulations, which forbid the flying of any flag above ours on American soil or at any American military installation.⁴

On July 10, 1964, an Alliance for Progress team submitted to the government of Panama a report saying that Panama should be given a more important role in the operation of the Canal; that Panamanians should be promoted to positions of high responsibility in the Canal organization; and that the U.S. should return to Panama all land in the Canal Zone that is not indispensable for maintenance, defense, and sanitation of the Canal.⁵ Alliance for Progress is the organization which dispenses United States tax money to Panama and other Latin American countries.

On July 15, 1964, the government of Panama released a report revealing its future plans for the Canal Zone. Among other things, Panama will force all Canal Zone residents (Panamanians and non-Panamanians alike) to move out. This will require them to live somewhere in the Republic of Panama where the government of Panama can levy income taxes on them. This plan is supported, in part, by the Alliance for Progress.⁶

On December 18, 1964, President Johnson—with the election safely behind him—announced that he would negotiate a new treaty to recognize Panama's sovereignty over the Canal Zone.⁷

On September 24, 1965, Johnson gave a progress report, saying that, after 18 months of negotiations, the U.S. and Panama had decided to abolish the 1903 treaty, replacing it with a new one which would recognize Panama's sovereignty over the Canal Zone and permit "political, economic, and social integration" of the Zone into the Republic of Panama. The new treaty will also provide for a new sea-level canal across Panama—if the commission studying the prob-

lem decides that Panama is the best place for a new canal.⁸

Johnson says he thinks the new sea-level canal being planned can be built on the site of the present Canal; but he promises that Panama will receive "adequate compensation for any economic damage suffered" if the new canal is built elsewhere. The implication of this promise is enormous. Panama's two largest cities—Colon and Panama City, at the Pacific and Atlantic terminals of the Panama Canal—will die if a bigger Canal is built elsewhere. Johnson's promise of "adequate compensation" can mean nothing less than putting Panama's two major cities on the American dole forever.⁹

On October 7, 1965, Diogenes de la Rosa (an admitted marxist who is Panama's negotiator in treaty talks with the U.S.) spoke to the Panama National Assembly, giving Panama's official reaction to the promises President Johnson had made on September 24. De la Rosa said that Panama's objective is "a Panamanian canal in Panamanian territory under the Panamanian flag." He acknowledged that in 1964, Panama's direct income from the Canal was \$115.4 million, which generated activities totaling another \$233 million for Panama. This income derived from the Panama Canal Zone was 39% of the Republic of Panama's gross national product (\$578.8 million)—a "fearful figure," de la Rosa said.¹⁰

Panama demands that the U.S. continue to supply technology, experience, and money to operate the Canal, but under Panamanian direction and sovereignty, guaranteeing to Panama whatever economic benefits Panama feels she should receive. Panama also demands that we pay for the privilege of rendering such vital services to Panama by: (1) constructing another bridge across the Canal—this one on the Atlantic side; (2) providing ports, piers, and auxiliary installations for the cities of Panama and Colon; (3) improving and expanding our facilities for furnishing sanitary water to the Republic of Panama; (4) providing short-range and long-range "training of Panamanians in all occupations."¹¹ In other words, they want us to pay for a poverty program that will embrace the total population of Panama.

On February 3, 1966, Dr. Arnulfo Arias (former President of Panama who was defeated by Marco A. Robles in 1964) said the Panamanian people will accept no treaty with the U.S. which is negotiated by the Robles administration. Asked whether he would support a Robles-negotiated treaty that conformed with his own position, Arias said, facetiously:

"If the treaty is very good—if they give us a few little things like New York City—we accept it."¹²

When the January, 1964, riots erupted in Panama, a propaganda campaign against the Panama Canal erupted in the United States. The theme of the campaign was that the Panama Canal, great in its time but now inadequate and obsolete, should be replaced with a larger sea-level canal. On September 2, 1964, Congress hastily passed a bill appropriating a large amount of tax money

² "Johnson Talk on Panama," *The New York Times*, January 24, 1964, p. 13.

³ "Texts on Panama Accord," *The New York Times*, April 4, 1964, p. 2.

⁴ "Humble Pie," editorial, *The Dallas Morning News*, April 28, 1964, Sec. 4, p. 2.

⁵ "RP Needs Bigger Role in PC, Alliance Says," *Panama American*, July 10, 1964, p. 1.

⁶ "Shift Zonians To RP, Levy Taxes, RP Asks," *Panama American*, July 15, 1964, p. 1.

⁷ "U.S. Decides To Dig A New Canal At Sea Level In Latin America and Renegotiate Panama Pact," by Tad Szulc, *The New York Times*, December 19, 1964, pp. 1, 10.

⁸ "U.S. to Scrap 1903 Treaty With Panama," by Mike Quinn, *The Dallas Morning News*, September 25, 1965, p. 1.

⁹ "U.S. Giving Up Canal," by Michael Pakenham and Jules DuBois, *Chicago Tribune*, September 25, 1965, pp. 1, 2.

¹⁰ "RP's Sweeping Treaty Agenda Revealed," *Star & Herald* (English-language newspaper published in Panama), October 8, 1965, pp. 1, 8.

¹¹ "Arias Says Government Lacks Support To Get Treaty Passed," *Star & Herald*, February 4, 1966, p. 1 ff.

for studies of sea-level canal alternatives to the present Canal.¹²

The propaganda (preparing Americans to accept without protest the giveaway of one of their most valuable possessions, by convincing them it is no longer useful) does not recognize, much less answer, the critical question: If our government will not hold on to the Panama Canal which it has owned and operated for 52 years, will our government protect a multi-billion-dollar investment in a new canal?

Surrendering our Canal Zone territory and giving away our present Canal will whet foreign appetites for more. If we build a new canal (in Panama or elsewhere in Central America) the nation that provides the right-of-way will demand full sovereignty and ownership.

In all Central American nations where a sea-level canal might be built, general political instability is so commonplace, and communist influence so strong, that a canal operated under any authority except the exclusive authority of the United States would be a detriment, not an asset, to our nation.

From the day the Republic of Panama was born, her economy has revolved around benefits provided by the United States. Her military security, and the health of her people, depend on us. Our treatment of Panama has always been magnanimous. Our only disservice to that nation has resulted from our government's efforts to comply with the outrageous demands of Panama politicians—thus encouraging them to keep their country in turmoil, making it profitable for them to play politics with the "yankee imperialism" propaganda of communism.

The treaty of 1903—the birth certificate of the Republic of Panama—did not give us too much in comparison with what Panama got.

When we acquired right to build the Canal, we accepted responsibility to maintain, operate, and defend it. A vulnerable, critically-important, ten-mile-wide strip of land such as the Canal Zone cannot be easily defended by military bases confined within the strip itself. Our government did not insist on a wider Canal Zone in 1903, because the Treaty gave us the right to acquire any property anywhere in Panama which might be needed for operation, sanitation, or defense of the Canal.

In the treaty of 1936-39 and in the treaty of 1955, the Republic of Panama promised to cooperate in every way feasible to demonstrate mutual understanding and cooperation between the two countries and to strengthen bonds of understanding and friendship between their respective peoples.

Panama has blatantly and continuously violated the expressed intent of both treaties. Hence, we should declare both treaties null and void. We should return to the terms of the original treaty of 1903, and enforce them meticulously, with the military might of our nation if necessary.

The present Panama Canal is not obsolete. It is too small for a few of our aircraft carriers, but will handle most of our naval craft and commercial vessels. We should keep the Canal, as well as the Zone surrounding it, exclusively under our jurisdiction and control, making whatever improvements our national interests may require. We do not need the consent or approval of Panama. All we need is an aroused and determined public which will compel our government to assert our national rights.

Suggestion: Begin now demanding that Congress stop spending tax money on plans for a new transisthmian canal. Begin now bombarding U.S. Senators with demands that the Senate reject the new U.S.-Panama treaty when President Johnson submits it.

¹² Help! Save The Panama Canal," by Harold Lord Varney, *American Opinion* reprint, March, 1965, 16 pp.

A DAY TO REMEMBER

Mr. STUCKEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. RODINO] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Georgia?

There was no objection.

Mr. RODINO. Mr. Speaker, last December 5 was a landmark day in the history of Montclair, N.J. For it was on that day that Lt. Col. Edwin E. (Buzz) Aldrin returned to his hometown to receive a hero's welcome. There were numerous difficulties in arranging a reception for this courageous American astronaut, but I am proud to say the citizens of Montclair met the challenge with superb ability and speed. I would like to include in the Record an editorial from the Montclair Times of December 15 commenting on this historic occasion and the local effort which made possible this unforgettable event. As the editorial concludes, it was "a day which showed that this community, given a good reason and a sound purpose, can do a matchless job."

The editorial follows:

A DAY TO REMEMBER

In its constant effort for perfection, Montclair has never come closer than it did on Dec. 5 when Lieutenant Colonel Edwin E. (Buzz) Aldrin returned home as the principal figure in a welcome whose size and warmth surprised even him.

There were all sorts of potential obstacles when the idea was first broached by Commissioner Theodore MacLachlan who became chairman of the committee in charge. There was no assurance, for instance, that Buzz would be allowed to take the time for a hometown visit. Later, when the assurance arrived, the date was problematical. When the date was finally fixed, the time was short. In addition, Montclair had never done anything quite like it.

But Montclair's citizenry has talent, experienced talent, willing talent. This talent went to work with unstinting effort. Montclair's citizenry has warmth and pride in its own. Both were shown on Dec. 5, beyond any question.

The crowning touch was the honored guest, himself. He is an astronaut to the world, a lieutenant colonel to the Air Force, a doctor of philosophy to Massachusetts Institute of Technology. But to friends and associates of his boyhood he was, and will ever remain, Buzz.

Dec. 5 was a day Montclair will forever remember. Not only was it a day when one of its own sons was honored, but a day which showed that this community, given a good reason and a sound purpose, can do a matchless job.

NEED TO REVISE SELECTIVE SERVICE LAW—III

Mr. STUCKEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. KASTENMEIER] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Georgia?

There was no objection.

Mr. KASTENMEIER. Mr. Speaker, the Defense Department has been

caught between the long range need to tailor the military to the increased technological demands of warfare in a nuclear age and a flooding manpower pool. Military strategy and tactics are continually undergoing radical changes in anticipation of future developments. The machinery of modern defense is increasingly becoming fantastically more intricate and technical, and the weapons systems of the present age are regarded as but a passing stage in the headlong rush to technological discovery. America's defense is now so complex, its demands for highly skilled and specialized manpower so great, that the old-fashioned conscript army, in which many men serve short terms of duty, is becoming less and less suited to the needs of modern arms and it is becoming more and more expensive to maintain. The mission of the Defense Department is to make the National Defense Establishment as efficient as possible. Yet, strangely enough, the principles and practices which guide the recruitment, motivation, compensation, and development of men have not changed substantially or kept pace with other changes over the years.

The principles upon which our military conscription are based have not received a public airing since 1951. Congress has not been willing to take the responsibility of trying new approaches to manpower procurement, or, for the most part, even admit that the situation now may be too complex to rely upon a conscription policy developed primarily for a total mobilization situation. It has been clear for some time, however, that the inequities arising from the present law have bred dissatisfaction and cynicism.

There have been, in the past, too many piecemeal investigations of the military manpower problem. If there is to be an improvement upon the allocation of our human resources, we must devote more thought and study to our present and future needs. Congress should start now to anticipate tomorrow's difficulties with an extensive and comprehensive study of the procurement policies and needs of the Military Establishment.

ARE WE ON THE BRINK OF ANOTHER ARMS RACE?

Mr. STUCKEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New York [Mr. BINGHAM] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Georgia?

There was no objection.

Mr. BINGHAM. Mr. Speaker, undoubtedly one of the main issues in the foreign policy field to confront the 90th Congress will be the question of whether the United States should promptly embark on the deployment of the antiballistic missile system.

My own conviction is that we should find some other way to respond to the reports that the Soviets have begun to construct such a system. Quite possibly, this is an area where our effort should be concentrated on seeking to slow down

the arms race by including the question of antiballistic systems in the agenda of our arms control discussions. The alternative would seem to be for us to embark, at enormous expense, on a new phase of the arms race, which is likely in the long run, to provide increased, rather than lessened danger, of a nuclear holocaust.

Yesterday the New York Times magazine contained a most interesting discussion of the subject by Roswell L. Gilpatric, of New York, who served as Under Secretary of the Air Force under President Truman and President Eisenhower and as Deputy Secretary of Defense under President Kennedy and President Johnson. This well-reasoned article is, I believe, worth careful study by all those who have an interest in this most vital issue.

I insert it herewith:

ARE WE ON THE BRINK OF ANOTHER
ARMS RACE?

(By Roswell L. Gilpatric)

For many people, the idea of an "arms race" acquired its sinister connotation some 20 years ago with the beginning of the nuclear-weapons age. Yet in fact rivalry in arms, even in its earlier and simpler manifestations, has always been a bane of mankind. Whenever two nations have found themselves in competition to develop, produce and deploy new arms, the results have been to divert national energy, resources and time from peaceful uses, to exacerbate relations between those nations in other fields by engendering fear and distrust, and, above all, to provide the ingredients of easily ignited conflict.

Notwithstanding the almost universal desire to contain competitive armament struggles, our generation has never been free of them. Since World War II the United States has gone through two cycles of competition with the Soviet Union in strategic armaments, and the signs are multiplying that we may be on the brink of engaging in still another arms race.

The first step-up in U.S. armaments after World War II grew out of Soviet actions and attitudes during the Berlin blockade of 1948-49 and the general intransigence of the Stalin regime on all international-security issues. When it became evident that the United States would have to provide itself with a strategic deterrent against Soviet aggressiveness, a decision was taken in the early nineteen-fifties to develop and produce a post-war generation of medium- and long-range jet bombers, first the subsonic B-47's and B-52's and later the supersonic B-58's. These manned-bomber programs were paralleled by other major technological advances, such as the development of more compact nuclear weapons through improvement in the yield-to-weight ratio of atomic warheads, and also by the production of jet tankers and the introduction of air-refueling techniques to make it possible for our bomber fleets to reach the heartland of Russia.

The Soviets reacted in two ways. First, they developed their own fleet of medium- and long-range bombers, the so-called Bears and Bisons; second, they installed elaborate defensive systems consisting of wide belts of antiaircraft cannon and missile emplacements supplemented by large fleets of interceptor aircraft.

These moves, in turn, led to extensive U.S. countermeasures, including the establishment of a far-flung radar network, known as the Distant Early Warning Line, whose outer perimeter extended from Alaska across the northern reaches of Canada to Greenland. Picket ships and plane-borne radar extended the bomber-warning systems along both the

East and West Coasts. The U.S. also set up, under joint command with Canada, numerous air-defense centers consisting of fighter aircraft and antibomber surface-to-air missiles. Finally, to tie together all of the elements in this vast complex for the defense of North America, there was installed during the mid-nineteen-fifties what was called the Semi-Automatic Ground Environment (SAGE) system.

All these offensive and defensive measures cost the U.S. many billions of dollars before much of the equipment involved was rendered obsolete by the advancing state of the military art.

From the start of the first post-World War II arms race, fundamental differences became apparent in the Soviet and U.S. responses to each other's strategic-weapons programs. The U.S. sought to emphasize and to invest more of its resources in offensive capabilities, whereas the Soviets have always stressed defensive measures. In consequence, as the Russians built up stronger defenses, the U.S. added to the numbers of its strategic forces and provided them with the capacity to penetrate Soviet defenses. At the same time we learned that beyond a certain level of defense, the cost advantage lies increasingly with offense.

The next lap in the arms race, beginning in the late fifties and continuing into the early sixties, was characterized chiefly by a partial shift from manned bombers to ballistic missiles, in both offensive and defensive roles, and by improved intelligence through satellite-based reconnaissance about what the other power was up to. After what at first appeared to be, but never in fact materialized as, an early Soviet lead—the so-called "missile gap" of 1950 and 1960—the U.S. forged ahead in both the quantity and the quality of its intercontinental ballistic missiles (ICBM's).

Quickly on the heels of the first generation, liquid-fueled Atlas and Titan missiles, launched from "soft"—that is, vulnerable—land-based sites, came the Minuteman and Polaris families of ICBM's solid-fueled and fired either from "hardened"—protected—underground silos or underwater from submarines. With a force destined soon to comprise 1,000 Minutemen and 656 Polaris missiles, U.S. ICBM's have consistently outnumbered the Soviet missile force by a ratio of 3 or 4 to 1. Moreover, for some time Soviet missiles were of less advanced types, being liquid-fueled and deployed in soft or semiprotected sites and hence vulnerable to attack.

During this same period of the early nineteen-sixties, both U.S. and Soviet defenses against bomber attacks were strengthened by the development and installation of successively improved models of surface-to-air missiles of which, characteristically, the Soviets deployed by far the greatest number. To cope with tougher Soviet defenses, U.S. bombers were modified to carry air-launched missiles in addition to gravity bombs and were equipped with electronic countermeasures to confuse Russian radar.

Both sides began developing antiballistic missile (ABM) systems, but it was only toward the end of 1966 that our Government acknowledged publicly that the Soviets had moved from the development stage to the quantity production and deployment of ABM's. In contrast, the U.S. has kept its ABM effort at the engineering design and development level and continued to place its principal reliance on the capacity of its strategic-weapons-delivery systems, whether bombers or missiles, to penetrate any type of Soviet defense, no matter how sophisticated.

After the Russians had been stood down during the Cuban missile crisis of 1962 and had reached an accord with the U.S. for a partial test ban treaty in 1963, it appeared

that the Soviets might accept the then-existing military equation with the U.S. and not challenge us to another round in the strategic arms race.

For a period after the present Soviet leadership headed by Brezhnev and Kosygin took over from Khrushchev, it seemed to be Soviet policy to seek a *détente* with the U.S. Our Government therefore felt safe in leveling off its strategic forces at least until the time—not expected before 1975-80—when the Chinese Communists might develop their own nuclear weapons to the point of being able to threaten the continental United States.

As 1966 drew to a close, however, the American people were told that not only were the Soviets proceeding with a comprehensive installation of ABM's, but in addition were setting out to build a larger force of solid-fueled and invulnerably sited ballistic missiles. Such a build-up might, it was indicated, reach a point, beginning in 1968, where the U.S. strategic force of some 1,650 Minutemen and Polaris missiles would no longer enjoy its present overwhelming margin of superiority.

It thus became apparent that, in determining how to respond to these new developments, the U.S. is once again facing the possibility of a stepped-up arms race with the Soviet Union of even more critical and dangerous proportions than the two previous cycles.

As he reviews the coming year's military proposals and budgets, President Johnson is therefore confronted with some hard choices regarding new weapons systems. Among them are the following:

(1) Should the U.S. now produce and deploy, either on a full or limited scale, an antiballistic missile system? The current version is known as the Nike X (consisting of two nuclear-tipped interceptor missiles, one short-range called Sprint and the other extended-range, the improved Zeus), supplemented with large numbers of a new high-performance interceptor aircraft, the F-12, and an extensive Civil Defense program for providing on a nationwide scale fallout shelter protection.

(2) Or should the U.S. instead rely for the maintenance of its "second strike" strategic deterrent on a new generation of ICBM's consisting of Minuteman III and Poseidon missiles, together referred to as Improved Capability Missiles (ICM's)—with the capacity to penetrate or saturate the new Soviet missile defenses?

(3) Should the U.S., in addition to procuring the new ICM's, equip its Air Force with quantities of an Advanced Manned Strategic Aircraft (AMSA) to take over the bomber role from the aging B-52 fleet and ultimately from the new supersonic jet bomber, the B-11, that will become operational a few years hence?

A go-ahead decision on the first, or the first and third, of these proposals will signalize a U.S. determination to do the Soviet Union one better in a new struggle for world power through force of arms and to base its relations with the Soviets more on a philosophy of conflict than on one of accommodation. Let us first consider the military implications of such a choice.

Defense Secretary McNamara states that the currently planned U.S. offensive force of missiles and bombers was specifically designed to hedge against several different contingencies, including the possibilities "first, that a Soviet ballistic-missile defense might be greater than expected by the intelligence estimates; and, second, that the Soviets might embark upon any one of several possible offensive build-ups, including variations in their target doctrine, variation in the technological sophistication of their weapons systems, and variations in the speed of deployment of those systems."

In thus taking into account possible Soviet threats over and beyond those projected in the latest national intelligence estimates, Secretary McNamara explains that "we have done so because an assured destruction capability, a capability to survive the first strike and survive with sufficient power to destroy the attacker, is the vital first objective which must be met in full regardless of the cost under all foreseeable circumstances and regardless of any difficulties involved."

His position is that, with the development of Minuteman III, the accelerated development of the Poseidon missile and moving ahead on new penetration aids to insure our weapons getting through any defenses the Soviets may put in place, the U.S. has in effect anticipated and insured against the latest moves by the Soviet Union. Notwithstanding a Russian ABM system and more and better Soviet ICBM's, he concludes that the U.S. strategic forces will continue to maintain their present power to survive a Soviet first strike with sufficient capability to destroy the attacker, which is the foundation of the deterrent power upon which our national security depends.

The conclusions of the Secretary of Defense are being severely questioned in a number of quarters. In the first place, there are indications that most of the professional military organization, from the Joint Chiefs of Staff on down, believes that the United States should go ahead with both production and deployment of an ABM system and also with a new generation of manned bombers as well as the new ICM's.

This military judgment will find strong support in the Congress, especially among the influential leaders of the Armed Forces committees, and will be backed by substantial sectors of public opinion, particularly in the South and on the Republican right. There is also likely to be considerable pressure from segments of the defense industry, backed by the communities that would benefit from increased armament production, for this nation to embark on a new round of strategic weapons building. It is possible that the Secretary of Defense's position may not enjoy undivided support even within the Johnson Administration.

But apart from the military implications of these new weapons choices, there are a number of political and economic issues which, so far as the public knows, may not have been fully considered.

If the U.S. decides to install ABM's to protect its population, should such systems also be placed in Europe, and if so, will not the countries on the other side of the Iron Curtain respond in kind? In that event, will the ABM's be furnished to our allies by ourselves, and to the bloc countries by the Soviets, and at whose cost?

Will our action to go ahead with an ABM deployment play into the hands of the Communist Chinese efforts to disrupt U.S.-U.S.S.R. relations? How far will we and the Soviets go beyond ABM's in building active defenses when the costs involved are measured by tens of billions of dollars, with enormous strategic implications and a long-lasting political impact?

The effects would be felt especially in Europe but also, as Communist Chinese nuclear capabilities develop, in India, Japan and other countries on the periphery of the Chinese mainland.

A new arms race will produce other casualties. Besides the hoped-for nuclear weapons nonproliferation treaty, toward which the Soviets and the U.S. have of late been making progress, there have long been under discussion between Russian and American disarmament negotiators a series of other arms-control measures. These include the extension of the partial test ban to include underground testing, the establishment of nuclear-free zones, a cut-off in the production of nuclear materials and a freeze on—

or possibly a reduction in—strategic delivery vehicles.

In the event of a new arms race, all this effort, and the partial foundations thereby constructed for further disarmament moves, will go by the board, and whatever headway has been built up, both at the U.N. and in the 18-nation disarmament conference at Geneva, will be lost. Indeed, even if the Soviet Union and the U.S. should in their own interests come to terms on a nonproliferation treaty, it is hardly to be expected that the major nuclear have-not nations, such as India and Japan, will sign away their rights to join the nuclear club at a time when its two charter members, Russia and the U.S., are building up rather than cutting down their nuclear arsenals.

Still another danger inherent in a renewed arms race lies in its short-term effect in Europe. For the U.S. to press ahead with a new strategic armament program would further weaken the NATO alliance, whose last meeting in Paris stressed the twin themes of *détente* with the Soviet Union and the "diminished threat of military aggression" rather than the need for greater defensive measures. The alliance already under strain because of our allies' concern over the heavy U.S. involvement in the Vietnam war, would suffer another blow if U.S.-U.S.S.R. relations took a turn for the worse.

In approaching its decisions, the Administration will presumably take into account positive as well as negative emanations from the Soviet Union. Among the favorable developments in U.S.-U.S.S.R. relations are the recently announced agreements for commercial air services between the two countries and for banning weapons of mass destruction from outer space.

Apart from their intrinsic significance, these developments indicate that the Soviet Union has not considered itself entirely inhibited from reaching agreements with the U.S. despite its predicament over Vietnam. This condition cannot, however, be expected to last if the Soviets feel themselves put in the position of countenancing U.S. bombing raids in the Hanoi area which produce civilian casualties. Undoubtedly, the present state of U.S.-U.S.S.R. relations would rapidly worsen if a significant intensification occurred in the scale of our air attacks against North Vietnam.

At worst, Soviet intentions regarding a renewed arms race should be treated as ambivalent and unclear rather than entirely negative. Their ABM deployment can be accounted for otherwise than as indicating a desire to alter the strategic power balance. It not only is in keeping with the ultimate in defensive postures but may also have resulted from military pressures within the Soviet regime rather than from a far-reaching decision to abandon the *détente* objective.

The latest increase in the Soviet defense budget is likewise equivocal. The announced rate of increase, 8.2 per cent, is not in itself of menacing proportions, although in announcing the rise in defense spending the Soviet authorities spoke of "recently sharpened international tensions" and the increased "danger of a new world war" because of "aggressive acts" of U.S. "imperialists."

Aside from these vital questions affecting international relations, the effect on our economy of a U.S. decision to proceed with ABM deployment and new strategic weapons would be tremendous. Depending on the timing and extent of these programs, the U.S. defense budget would be inflated by at least \$5-billion to \$6-billion a year, with the probable result that the present level of military expenditure, which will stay in the \$70-billion to \$75-billion-a-year range during the period of the Vietnam war, would thereafter remain at that order of magnitude in-

stead of receding to the pre-Vietnam budget level of around \$50-billion a year.

The effect of this Federal spending and diversion of national resources might well be to reduce or delay further funding of U.S. space and supersonic transport programs as well as to forestall further financing of the Great Society programs such as antipoverty projects, Federal aid to education, demonstration cities and the like.

It is not, however, the economic cost of a decision to deploy ABM's as well as to all to the level of our bomber and missile forces that is the most disturbing aspect of a renewed arms race. With the U.S. gross national product estimated to rise to \$790 billion during 1967 and to grow at 4 per cent a year thereafter, projecting defense expenditure at 9 per cent of G.N.P. (compared to 15 per cent of G.N.P. during the Korean War) would produce a defense budget of over \$70-billion a year, which should not prove an intolerable burden on our economy. The price tag of another arms race, while staggering, is not in itself an argument against it.

What the United States faces is a major watershed in national security policy. Should it re-engage in an armament contest with the Soviet Union, or should it strive for more progress toward arms control and the substitution of political, economic and sociological measures for military force as means for insuring world peace?

In these terms, the question comes down to how the United States will exercise its acknowledged strength and world leadership—whether toward heightening the tension that will come from renewed emphasis on armaments and accelerated advances in weapons technology or in the direction of arms limitation and the solution of world problems through peaceful means.

Should the decision be reached during 1967 to proceed with any of the major new weapons systems now being pressed upon the President by some of his advisers, their opposite numbers in the Soviet would obviously be in a stronger position to insist on corresponding increases in Russian weapons projects.

The reaction in political terms would be even more dangerous, jeopardizing not only the *détente* so ardently sought after by our allies but also the fragile gains achieved through Soviet restraint in recent years in such troubled areas of the world as Africa, Latin America and on the India-Pakistan subcontinent.

The decisions which the President now faces are made doubly difficult by the national mood of frustration over the way the war is going in Vietnam. All-to-ready distrust of the Soviets' intentions, coupled with anger at their growing aid to Vietnam, would prompt many of our people to view with suspicion or antagonism a national policy of forbearance in dealing with the Soviet Union. For others, an effort to moderate the competition in arms would be regarded as a sign of weakness and a peril to our national security.

Yet President Johnson has recognized, as did President Kennedy, that if a third world war is to be avoided the United States, as the most advanced of the superpowers, must take the lead in demonstrating a willingness to practice self-discipline both in the use of force and in providing itself with the power to apply force. The present situation puts to a critical test our national determination not to be swerved from the rightness and sanity of that course.

REPORT ON VIETNAM

Mr. STUCKEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New York [Mr. BINGHAM] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Georgia?

There was no objection.

Mr. BINGHAM. Mr. Speaker, early last December my wife and I visited Vietnam for almost a week. I sent back to the weekly newspapers in my district two reports on this visit, as follows:

LETTER FROM SAIGON, DECEMBER 1966

We are leaving Vietnam today, after almost a week here, and, believe it or not, we are sorry to leave. We have met scores, perhaps hundreds, of Vietnamese and Americans that we liked and admired. They are working well together and they believe in what they are doing. To our own surprise, we can well understand what it is that causes many Americans, especially if they are working in civil action programs, to sign up for second and third tours of duty in Vietnam.

During our visit, we saw not only Saigon, but also Danang and Hue in the north. I was able to spend a day in the Mekong delta region southwest of Saigon and a morning at Vungtau, on the coast south of Saigon, where there is a huge training camp for the new Vietnamese "revolutionary development" teams. I met with Ambassador Lodge, General Westmoreland, and many other Americans, as well as with Vietnamese, both military and civilian.

I want to say at the outset that I have not changed my mind about the vital importance of finding a peaceful solution to the conflict or about the impossibility of concluding this war by a military victory in the usual sense. But I did reach some new conclusions about what is going on in South Vietnam itself which I will outline for you in my next letter.

In this letter, I should like to give you a few vignettes which will, I hope give you some idea of what our visit was like.

Saigon's Tansonghut airport, which we saw as we arrived and left, and several times in between, is said to be the busiest in the world. Aircraft of every size and shape—my wife called it "a zoo of airplanes"—are landing and taking off every few seconds, using merging and even crossing runways. The planes often seem to be tail-gating each other, but the accident rate is remarkably low, a tribute to the joint Vietnamese-American control-tower operation and to the skill of the pilots. The main airport building is crowded with GIs, most of them waiting to go on "R & R" (rest and recreation) in Bangkok or Hong Kong. Tansonghut airport was attacked while we were in Vietnam, but little damage was done. Eighteen Vietcong were killed and three captured.

In Saigon itself, the traffic has to be seen to be believed. Thousands of trucks, jeeps, cars, "cycles" (pedal-operated top-less hansom cabs), motor scooters, bicycles, and a few horse-drawn vehicles compete for driving space on the wholly insufficient and very dirty streets. Nobody pays attention to the center-line of a two way street, so that all are playing "chicken" (to see who will give way first) constantly. They do this with no change of expression and without shouting or getting angry. Among the serenely aggressive cyclists are many beautiful girls, gliding along in their lovely, full-length, billowing dress. To be sure, accidents are not infrequent, but most of the time the people get where they want to go. All this is characteristic of the Vietnamese people: they are proud, determined and courageous and, most of the time, effective.

Our American host and hostess in Saigon live in a downtown second-floor apartment in a building which they have owned for years. He is co-owner of an importing business. Their three children are now away at school but have spent long periods in Saigon. This family lives the normal routine of an

American family abroad. They admit that their friends and relatives cannot understand why they choose to live in Saigon.

In Danang we stayed in the house of another old friend, a man who is head of our AID program for the region. His wife, under present policy, is not allowed to live there and has to stay in Bangkok where he visits her once a month or so. He thinks Danang is now safe enough for her at least to be allowed to visit. The evening we were there he happened to be giving a farewell party for the Marines' second in command. It was heartwarming to see the close relationship between the military and civilian personnel who have to work together.

That day Lieutenant-General Walt, Commanding Officer of the Marines in Vietnam, had given us an unexpected tour of the Danang area in his "helicopter." He also arranged for us to see a "Combined Action Company" (CAC) outpost where four or five Marine enlisted men and thirty or so Vietnamese militia live together and protect the security of the area together against guerrillas. In a village nearby, we were greeted with dazzling smiles from the school children, and we listened to them sing "Row Row Row Your Boat" led by a young Marine Captain who was in charge of civic action for the area.

We saw many schools built or under construction with materials supplied by USAID and labor donated by the local community. One such school, with 8 or 10 classrooms being built of reinforced concrete, was proudly shown me by a tough-looking Vietnamese major who has been given the job of district chief. (This word "chief," to the extent that it suggests a tribal chief, is wholly misleading; as used in Vietnam, it is based on the French word "chef" and simply means "head" or perhaps "governor".) Laying brick at the school were, working side by side, parents of the children and local militiamen. The U.S. had supplied most of the materials and would supply many of the paper-back textbooks (nine million of these have already been distributed in Vietnam by USAID; they are written by Vietnamese; we help with the layout and pay for the paper and printing). Like virtually every building in the delta countryside at this time of year, the school was surrounded by flooded rice fields and had to be reached from the road by a little causeway.

Not all sights were so pleasant, by any means. For example, a sizeable hospital in Danang was filled to overflowing with civilian casualties of the fighting. A general practitioner from North Carolina, who volunteered for a year, showed us around. He was full of praise for the job an AMA-recruited team of surgeons was doing. The hospital was pleasantly casual with lots of family members visiting. One little boy of about nine followed us about on crutches, cheerfully practising his few words of English. His right foot was gone.

Much more encouraging was the hour we spent at a receiving station for Vietcongs who come in under the "Chu Hoy" (open arms) program. We talked to a highly sensitive Major from Boston in charge, to his Vietnamese counterpart, and to two of the "returnees," who seemed bright and cheerful in their new status. They said, in response to questions, that they had been conscripted into the Vietcong from their villages. (Often this is the case, but we were aware that they might be saying this just to please us.) In recent months, the flow of "chu hoy" has grown rapidly. By the end of this month, some 16,000 will have come in during 1966. They are retrained and settled in jobs or areas where they will hopefully be safe from Vietcong retaliation.

The U.S. is helping with teacher training in a big way, to staff the thousands of new schools being built. In the delta town of Vinh Hong, I watched a young Negro girl from Michigan teaching English to a class of young men and women in a normal school. She is doing a two-year stint with the Inter-

national Volunteer Service, a kind of smaller, privately run Peace Corps that is doing a fine job in Vietnam and Laos.

The only mishap that occurred on the trip was when one of our pilots (we had to fly by small plane or "chopper" everywhere, because most of the roads are still considered insecure) got his face scalded when he opened a thermos of hot water for coffee at high altitude and the pressure blew the water all over him!

On several occasions, I sought out and met boys from the Bronx. These were all in the Armed Services and seemed to be getting along fine. I said I would be glad to call their parents when I got back and I am looking forward to doing so."

II. FINAL REPORT ON VIETNAM, DECEMBER 1966

Our strongest single feeling about Vietnam was one of admiration and indeed affection for virtually all the Americans and Vietnamese we met there, both military and civilian. They are working together with skill and dedication at a task they believe in, cheerfully accepting the risks involved. That task (for we were looking primarily at the civil rather than the purely military side) is the political, economic and social development of a country in the midst of a war.

(The last time we had had a similar feeling of inspiration from observing a gigantic effort being made under the threat of danger was when we first visited Israel in 1952, when Israel's survival was even more in danger than it is today.)

The size and scope of the USAID program in Vietnam is often not realized in the U.S. We are, for instance, helping with the construction of about 2,000 classrooms this year (mainly by providing the building materials; most of the labor is contributed by the town and village people themselves). We are helping to train the teachers needed (about 3200 in 1966) and to print the paperback textbooks.

Through representatives located in every one of South Vietnam's 44 provinces, and who work with the Vietnamese provincial governors, USAID is providing millions of dollars worth of materials for local self-help projects; depending upon what the village or hamlet councils decide they want most, these can be, in addition to schools, concrete washing platforms at the river's edge, basic housing, wells, market places, simple clinic dispensaries.

Our medical-surgical teams, along with similar teams from a number of European and Asian countries, are caring for civilian patients and upgrading standards of care in most of the province hospitals. Hundreds of American youngsters, who have joined the International Volunteers Service (like the Peace Corps Volunteers in other countries), are living in small towns and villages around the country, teaching, working with farmers, helping with community development.

With advice and logistical and financial support, the U.S. is helping the Vietnamese government with the training of hundreds of 59-man "revolutionary development" teams to work in rural areas at the complex job of defense against terrorism combined with civic progress. The main training camp at Vungtau, south of Saigon, has 5,000 young men, mostly with a fourth or fifth grade education, and several hundred young women, currently engaged in a 14-week course.

When they go to live in the villages to which they will be assigned for 3 to 6 months at a time, their main objective will be to give the villagers a sense of identification with their own government as an entity of which they are a part and which wants to and can help them to achieve their own local goals. (Historically, the Vietnamese villagers have regarded the central government as a foreign

agency that brought only trouble—tax collectors, conscriptors, and badly behaved soldiers.)

The biggest obstacle to success in all of these efforts is lack of security. While in recent months, our forces, with help from the Vietnamese army, have stopped cold any effective action by the Viet Cong "main forces" and North Vietnamese Army units, the problem of continued VC guerrilla activity in the cities, villages and countryside has not been solved; it is in fact not much better than it was a year or 18 months ago when the overall military situation was much worse.

Vietcong guerrillas can and do carry out limited operations in Saigon and other cities; they make most country highways unsafe for unescorted Vietnamese government or American travelers; they effectively control a large percentage of the hamlets and they can and do conduct raids and assassinate local officials in many if not most of the rest.

Local villagers that are determined to prevent this kind of terrorism can do so, because they can always identify VC (better than city people can) and report them to the authorities. Thus the VC can do nothing in the area where the members of the strongly anti-communist Hoa-Hao sect live.

Most villagers are not yet that highly motivated. Hopefully, they will be in time, if the "revolutionary development" program succeeds in giving them a stake in their government, a sense of participation, and also if the VC continues the kind of senseless terrorism that creates antagonism and that is now increasingly common (such as blowing up a local passenger bus jammed with villagers).

Meanwhile, if the "revolutionary development" and other programs are to be able to operate, so as eventually to win the active support of the villagers, they must have better protection than they have now.

Providing this protection is the most urgent need in Vietnam at present, and it is a job that must be done by the Vietnamese army (American forces should usually be reserved for major military operations). For this task, which is irksome as well as dangerous, involving a lot of night duty, the Vietnamese army must be retrained. The Vietnamese troops must, above all, be taught to work with the villagers, and not to molest them. This retraining and re-orientation will take time and a lot of effort, on the part both of the Vietnamese government and the American military. I am afraid that the necessary priority has not yet been assigned to this task by either group.

On the political side much progress is being made. I am satisfied that the Constituent Assembly elections demonstrated wide-spread desire of the people to participate in the political process, in spite of threats by the VC, and in spite, in some cases, of actual VC firing at people waiting in line to vote. The voting did not, on the other hand, mean support for the Ky regime. We talked with some of the leading delegates to the Constituent Assembly, including the President, Than Khac Suu, and the well-known physician-politician, Dr. Phan Quang Dan. They are taking their work very seriously and making good progress. It is of the utmost importance that nothing be allowed to interfere with the further growth of a constitutional and basically democratic government in Vietnam. On the big question of how best to bring the war in Vietnam to an end, I am more convinced than ever that it cannot be done by a military victory in the usual sense. As one of our top generals put it to us, "this war will not be won by bullets."

Since U.S. military operations against major enemy units have been going so well, I see no need for intensification of our purely military efforts, and I would therefore oppose any such expansion or intensification as wasteful of human and economic resources and as risking a wider war. In Vietnam

Americans and Vietnamese alike are prepared for a long war. They do not expect Hanoi to show any interest in negotiations, and almost without exception they favor our present policies, including bombing of the north (although some feel the cost of the latter is becoming excessive) they do not believe suspension of bombing or an offer for a mutual cease-fire would change Hanoi's attitude or bring about any lessening of military efforts by Hanoi or the VC.

In any case however, we simply cannot give up on the chance of achieving a cessation of hostilities (including local terrorism). A total cease-fire would be a blessing from a humanitarian point of view. It would also permit the work of political, economic, and social development in South Vietnam, which has now been well started, to go forward much more rapidly.

Accordingly, I feel that every step that might get negotiations started and the shooting stopped should be taken so long as we do nothing to jeopardize the right of the Vietnamese people to control their own destiny. One such step would be a clear statement by the U.S. that the N.L.F. would sit, in their own right, at the negotiating table. Another would be an offer of an indefinite mutual cease-fire, to include, necessarily, terrorist attacks. A third would be for an indefinite suspension of bombing in the north.

While I realize in the short-run such a suspension might mean greater difficulties (and higher casualties) for our forces in south Vietnam, I believe the effort must be made in the hope of saving many more lives, American and Vietnamese, in the long-run. Our newly re-elected Secretary-General of the U.N., U Thant, says our bombing of the north is an absolute block to any negotiations. Many others, including the Soviets, say the same thing. How can we know they are not right?

NATIONAL CONSUMER INFORMATION FOUNDATION

Mr. STUCKEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New York [Mr. ROSENTHAL] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Georgia?

There was no objection.

Mr. ROSENTHAL. Mr. Speaker, Congress has a special responsibility to seek new ways of enabling the American consumer to make intelligent, well-informed choices in the marketplace. It is the declared policy of Congress, as stated in the Fair Packaging and Labeling Act of 1966, that "informed consumers are essential to the fair and efficient functioning of the free market economy."

To give effect to that policy, I am introducing a bill today to establish a National Consumer Information Foundation. Its mission will be to develop and disseminate unbiased information about the performance, content, safety, and care characteristics of consumer products. In particular, the Foundation will be authorized to develop a system of information labeling which would be open to all manufacturers to join. Participating manufacturers would be authorized to attach a label to each product, the label bearing the seal of the Foundation and whatever information concerning the characteristics of the product was required by the Foundation.

Although initially launched with the Federal funds, the Foundation would be self-supporting—its income generated by the sale to manufacturers of the labeling tags. It would be managed by a Board of Directors appointed by the President with the advice and consent of the Senate.

The system to be known as "Info-Tag," resembling the British "Teltag," literally refers to a tag on the product which provides information about its performance. The voluntary labeling system proposed in the legislation would not grade or otherwise classify products as "best buys." But it would describe the characteristics of interest to the consumer, leaving the final choice or selection up to him. You might be interested in some examples of how it would work:

First. The Foundation, upon deciding that carpets should be more adequately labeled, would proceed to identify that product's most important performance characteristics. A carpet manufacturer interested in using the Foundation label would submit his product for testing. On the basis of its findings, the Foundation would then issue a label on which, for example, it might include information on the following characteristics: the durability of the rug, its color fastness, its resistance to stains, and its washability or cleanability. Depending on where the consumer wants to use the rug, he would determine which particular characteristics are relevant to his needs. For instance, in a rug to be used in a children's playroom he might be more interested in durability and washability than in any other characteristics.

Second. Electric coffee pot manufacturers wishing to use the Foundation label might be required to supply the following information for the label: how many cups of coffee the pot will make, how long it will take to percolate, the length of time the coffee stays warm once it is made, and whether or not the pot is immersible in water for cleaning. Here again, depending on the use intended, one consumer may be more interested in the length of time the coffee can be kept warm; another, with the time the coffee takes to percolate. Thus, the label enables the consumer to make an intelligent, informed choice on the basis of his particular requirements.

An objective and impartial labeling system such as this could be immensely useful to both consumers and manufacturers. For the consumer, it would provide the kind of hard information he rarely gets from advertising. For the manufacturer, the label, though not a mark of quality, would indicate that he has enough confidence in his product to declare its characteristics and is willing to adhere to the standards printed on the label. Such a system of voluntary labeling will facilitate competition among existing producers and foster entrance into the marketplace of small entrepreneurs now excluded because of prohibitive advertising requirement and costs.

I urge that Congress give favorable consideration to my bill during this session. The consumer is daily confronted by a bewildering array of choices between new materials, products, and services.

Given the complex and rapidly changing nature of our economy, his task will become even more difficult in the future. The Info-Tag system proposed here would bring to the consumer the information he needs to make an intelligent choice.

The text of the bill follows:

H.R. 2374

A bill to establish a National Consumer Information Foundation as an independent agency in the executive branch of the Federal Government.

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled.

SHORT TITLE

SECTION 1. This Act may be cited as the "National Info-Tag Act".

ESTABLISHMENT

SEC. 2. There is established in the executive branch of the Federal Government a foundation which shall be known as the National Consumer Information Foundation (hereafter in this Act referred to as the "Foundation").

BOARD OF DIRECTORS

SEC. 3. (a) The Foundation shall be headed by a Board of Directors composed of five Directors appointed by the President by and with the advice and consent of the Senate. The President shall designate one Director as Chairman of the Board. A vacancy in the Board of Directors shall be filled in the same manner as the original appointment was made.

(b) (1) Except as provided in paragraphs (2) and (3) of this subsection, Directors of the Foundation shall be appointed for terms of three years.

(2) Of the Directors first appointed, two shall be appointed for terms of one year, two shall be appointed for terms of two years, and one shall be appointed for a term of three years, as designated by the President at the time of appointment.

(3) Any Director of the Foundation appointed to fill a vacancy occurring before the expiration of the term for which his predecessor was appointed shall be appointed only for the remainder of such term. A Director may serve after the expiration of his term until his successor has taken office.

(c) Section 5315 of title 5, United States Code, is amended by adding at the end thereof the following:

"(78) Directors, National Consumers Information Foundation."

(d) Three Directors of the Foundation shall constitute a quorum.

ADMINISTRATOR AND STAFF

SEC. 4. (a) The Foundation shall have an Administrator who shall be appointed by the Board of Directors. The Administrator shall administer the Foundation in accordance with directives of the Board of Directors.

(b) The Board of Directors may appoint and fix the compensation of such additional personnel as it deems advisable to carry out the provisions of this Act.

INFO-TAG SYSTEM

SEC. 5. (a) The Foundation shall establish and operate a system under which it may grant authority to a person who manufactures for sale at retail a nonperishable manufactured consumer product to affix to such product a label to be called an info-tag.

(b) The Foundation shall have the authority to develop and approve a standard info-tag which specifies the kind of information to be provided for each type of product for which info-tags are to be made available. A standard info-tag shall bear (1) the name,

seal, or other distinctive mark of the Foundation and (2) such information with respect to performance, content, safety, durability, care, and other characteristics as the Foundation determines to be necessary or useful to permit a reasonably prudent consumer to evaluate a particular product for purposes of purchase.

(c) The standard info-tag for any type of product shall be developed by the Foundation after consultation with interested manufacturers, distributors, and users, and shall be prescribed in rules of the Foundation. The Foundation may, if it determines it to be in the public interest, prescribe data formulated by reputable standard-making bodies, including trade associations and similar groups.

(d) At least ninety days before any such rules are prescribed by the Foundation for any product, such rules shall be published in the Federal Register.

(e) Any person may file written objections to the adoption of any such rules until the sixtieth day after the date of publication of such proposed rules in the Federal Register. After reviewing such objections and other pertinent information, the Foundation may, by order, adopt and promulgate such rules, amend such rules, or refuse to adopt such rules. Such an order of the Foundation shall not be subject to review.

(f) The Foundation shall by rule establish schedules of fees and charges which shall be paid by persons participating or seeking participation in the info-tag system. Such fees and charges shall be related to the cost to the Foundation of carrying out the function or providing the materials or services for which they are paid, but shall include such surcharge as the Foundation determines to be equitable but necessary in order to place the Foundation on a self-sustaining financial basis.

(g) Before authority is granted to any applicant to affix info-tags to any product, the Foundation must (1) have on file a report from a laboratory maintained by it or a certified report from an independent testing laboratory determined by it to be reliable setting forth the information which should be on the info-tag to be affixed to such product, and (2) have received payment of all fees and charges fixed by it and due in connection with the granting of such authority.

(h) The Foundation shall not evaluate one product as being superior to or less expensive than another.

(i) The Foundation shall maintain constant surveillance over products to which info-tags are affixed to assure that such products conform to information on the info-tags affixed to them and may require additional testing to assure that specimens of the product to which an info-tag has been affixed conform in every respect with information on such info-tag.

(j) The Foundation may revoke or suspend authority granted under this section for willful or repeated violations of rules issued by the Foundation in connection with the info-tag system under this section.

(k) The Foundation may by rule exclude any nonperishable manufactured consumer product or class of such products from the info-tag system under this section if it determines that inclusion of such product or class of products would not be beneficial to a substantial number of the consumers of such product or class of products, or would not lend itself to such a system.

PENALTIES

SEC. 6. Whoever counterfeits an Info-Tag, or knowingly and willfully affixes an Info-Tag to any product other than a product with respect to which authority granted by the Foundation is in effect therefor, for the purpose of selling such product to another person, shall be fined not more than \$5,000.00

or imprisoned not more than one year, or both.

POWERS

SEC. 7. For the purpose of carrying out its functions under section 5, the Foundation may—

(1) Establish and maintain a laboratory, reference library, and related facilities;

(2) Make such investigations as it deems necessary (a) to determine if any person has violated or is about to violate any provision of this Act or any rule or order of the Foundation or (b) to aid in enforcing this Act or in formulating rules or orders;

(3) Use, on a reimbursable basis, the services, equipment, personnel, supplies, and facilities of Federal departments and agencies and, on a reimbursable or other basis, other public or nonprofit persons, institutions, or organizations;

(4) Enter into and perform such contracts, leases, cooperative agreements, or other transactions as it may determine to be necessary on such terms as it may determine to be appropriate;

(5) Appoint such advisory committees and consultants for such periods of time as it determines;

(6) Make, issue, rescind, or amend rules governing the manner of its operation and the exercise of its functions;

(7) Publish and disseminate reports and publications;

(8) Establish an official seal which shall be judicially noticed;

(9) Establish and maintain such field offices in the United States and abroad as it may determine to be necessary; and

(10) Engage in, and support, by grant or contract, research with respect to, and development of, objective or quantitative standards for nonperishable manufactured consumer products.

ANNUAL REPORT

SEC. 8. The Foundation shall transmit to the President and the Congress in January of each year a report which shall include a comprehensive statement of the activities of the Foundation during the preceding calendar year, together with such recommendations for additional legislation as it may deem useful or necessary to carry out any of the provisions of this Act.

APPROPRIATIONS AUTHORIZED

SEC. 9. There are hereby authorized to be appropriated such sums as may be necessary to carry out the provisions of this Act until the Foundation is operating on a financially self-sustaining basis.

THE PROGRESS OF THE MERIT SYSTEM

Mr. STUCKEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Hawaii [Mr. MATSUNAGA] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Georgia?

There was no objection.

Mr. MATSUNAGA. Mr. Speaker, it was my great privilege to listen to a most comprehensive, yet concise, history of the Civil Service Act of 1883, at the annual dinner of the American Federation of Government Employees, AFL-CIO, last Saturday evening, January 14, 1967, in observance of the 84th anniversary of the passage of the act and the fifth anniversary of the issuance of Executive Order No. 10988. The speaker was none other than our beloved Speaker of the House, the Honorable JOHN W. MCCORMACK. He was introduced by Mr. Ralph

Biser, national vice president of the association and later praised by Mr. John F. Griner, its national president. A crowd of over 1,500 Federal employees and their guests received the Speaker's message with great enthusiasm in a standing applause. It was clearly evident that JOHN W. McCORMACK was held in the highest esteem and most beloved by those present. The words of Dr. Edward Gardiner Latch, Chaplain of the U.S. House of Representatives, in his invocation perhaps best expressed the prevailing sentiments when he said:

We thank Thee for our Speaker—for his integrity of spirit, for his understanding heart, his sympathetic mind, his willingness to listen and yet to stand firm for what he believes is right. Underneath it all we thank Thee for his untiring and undying devotion to our Country. May his spirit be the spirit of us all.

Knowing that there are many who would want a copy of the Speaker's address, I have asked unanimous consent to insert it into the RECORD at this point. It will, I am sure, serve as a useful reference for all Members of Congress and those interested in the civil service. It follows:

THE CIVIL SERVICE: THE PROGRESS OF THE MERIT SYSTEM

(An address by the Honorable JOHN W. McCORMACK, Speaker of the U.S. House of Representatives)

I am indeed pleased to be with you this evening. On this occasion, we celebrate the 84th anniversary of the establishment of a sound system of public service—the signing of the Civil Service Act. This one single event in 1883 provided the basis for Government employment policies which has stood the test of time and which remains valid in principle to this day. The act itself—although by no means a panacea for all of the ills which had plagued Government service until that time—was nonetheless a blueprint for the future, and, for the first time in our history, gave statutory recognition to the concept that appointment to government service ought to be based upon merit—rather than upon ability to pay or upon past political activity.

Concurrently, we also celebrate the fifth anniversary of the issuance of Executive Order 10988. This order, issued by President Kennedy in 1962, for the first time gave official recognition to right of Federal employees to be represented by employee organizations and provided for a form of collective bargaining, granting public employees the same protection in employee-management relations enjoyed by workers in private industry. The significant growth in the membership rolls of your own organization attest to the substantial effect that this order has had.

You who are here this evening represent two and a half million government employees who, like yourselves, benefit directly from what the Civil Service Act and Executive Order 10988 have accomplished.

The Nation, in turn, directly benefits, since it is only due to the efforts of dedicated, honest, and intelligent employees that the government is able to provide the multitude of services which its citizens expect—indeed, demand—of it. As the country grows in wealth, in population, and in world responsibility, more and more demands are made upon the government, and upon you as government employees. Yet had it not been for what was accomplished by the signing of the Civil Service Act, the superior talents which the Government so desperately needs

might never have been encouraged into its service.

The establishment of a formal civil service system based upon merit did not occur overnight. It was a long and tedious journey—nor did that first act accomplish anywhere near the benefits which are enjoyed today, but it was the start, and as in the case of other great legislative advances held back for years through determined and selfish opposition, it was easier to make advances. The story of civil service reform in the United States is replete with some of the seamiest and most scandalous chapters in our history. Before we saw even the beginnings of a solid reform movement, the Government service had sunk to such an all-time low in prestige that Abraham Lincoln was caused to remark, "I'm afraid this thing is going to ruin republican Government, this incessant human wriggle and struggle for office."

The scandals of the spoils system of government appointments soil the early pages of our history. Even before the American Revolution, it was not uncommon that jobs in the British colonial service were given to political friends, mostly unqualified, or even sold to the highest bidder.

The framers of the Constitution quite specifically provided that certain Government officials—ambassadors, ministers, consuls, and judges of the Supreme Court—were to be appointed by the President with the advice and consent of the Senate. However, they were somewhat less specific about the method of appointing the remainder of the Government work force:

"The Congress may by law vest the appointment of such inferior officers, as they think proper, in the President alone, in the courts of law or in the heads of departments."

For nearly 80 years thereafter, however, Congress made little use of this constitutional grant of power, and the matter of filling governmental positions remained largely at the President's discretion.

In general, our early Presidents followed the precedent set by George Washington in granting appointments to Government service on an unofficial and—if not entirely pure—at least a relatively workable merit system. Washington himself made his appointments on the basis of a "fitness test" which inquired into the applicant's honesty, efficiency, and capability. Preference was given to former officers of the Revolutionary Army, but only if they had first passed the other tests of fitness.

Although following Washington's policy of appointment on the basis of fitness, the emergence of political parties added an additional dimension to certain appointments. On the eve of the Democratic-Republican Jefferson's taking office, in an attempt to retain some measure of Federalist control of the judiciary, a number of Federalists were appointed to circuit-court judgeships and justice of the peace positions. These were the famous "midnight appointments", and one, the appointment of William Marbury as justice of the peace in the District of Columbia, was the basis of a most important Supreme Court decision in the Nation's history.

Throughout the following decades, however, the system worked with a reasonable minimum of abuses, having in mind the conditions that existed at that time. Although appointments were certainly made on the basis of political party affiliation, appointees were generally well-qualified, and incumbents were rarely removed from office arbitrarily without just cause.

We then turn the corner into what is known as the "dark ages of the spoils system." The use of patronage positions which was firmly established in many States and city governments as a weapon of party strength and control crept into the Federal Government and for over fifty years became destructive. Thus began more than sixty

years of untrammelled greed and avarice in the securing of appointments to Government service. It was an era when exorbitant sums were paid for positions carrying small annual stipends—in many cases, of course, when the influence gained was well worth the price. It was an era when each change of administration brought about wholesale removal of Federal officials and appointment of party faithfuls to fill the vacancies. It was an era when—as the Nation was growing in population, wealth, and responsibility, and therefore needed the finest talents available—the Federal Government was staffed largely by incompetents who cared only for the personal advantage that could be derived from Government service.

By the time Lincoln took office, the clamour of office-seekers at the White House was so intense that they virtually dogged his every step. Engrossed with the cares of the Civil War on the one hand, and besieged by the hordes pleading for patronage on the other, his patience was sorely tried. While recovering from an attack of small pox, he is said to have remarked to an aide, "tell all the office-seekers to come in at once, for now I have something I can give to all of them."

The scandals caused by the spoils system in the post-Civil War years became so noxious that public opinion began to demand that something be done. President Grant, after several fruitless attempts to obtain a reform bill from Congress, finally succeeded on the closing day of the 1871 session in obtaining a bill which authorized him to "prescribe such regulations for the admission of persons into the civil service of the United States as may best promote the efficiency thereof." Under this power, the President appointed an "advisory board of the civil service," which recommended a merit system based on competitive examinations, classifications of positions for purposes of promotion, and a 6-month probationary period following appointment. The board functioned for two years, until its meager funds were eliminated by a Congress which was coming to appreciate the advantages that the spoils system provided it.

Reform of the civil service was ignored by Congress for the next several years. Although public groups formed to promote reform, and President Hayes did what he was able through Executive orders to establish a merit system of appointment, it took a Presidential assassination fully to awaken the realization that reform of the civil service could be avoided no longer.

Charles Giteau, an eccentric election worker in the 1880 campaign of President James Garfield, had been unsuccessful in his attempts to convince the President that for his efforts he deserved to be appointed to a consular position in Paris. On July 2 of 1881, as Garfield waited for a train in a Washington station, Giteau fired two bullets into the President which took his life in September of that year.

Three months later, Senator George H. Pendleton, of Ohio, introduced a bill drafted by the newly formed Civil Service Reform League. This bill looked likely to languish until organized public indignation forced civil service reform as a campaign issue in the fall elections of 1882. Congress was finally convinced. In December of that year, the Pendleton bill was passed by both Houses, and signed by President Arthur on January 16, 1883.

The new act, although far from perfect, nevertheless was a beginning. It established a Civil Service Commission of three members. It provided that appointments were to be made from those graded highest in merit examinations. It confirmed existing statutory veterans' preference provisions. And it stipulated that the recommendation of an applicant by a Member of Congress could be based only upon character and residence.

At the beginning, however, only 13,900 positions were covered by the new merit system—representing a mere 10.5 percent of the total Government work force. Thus, the new act did not, in a single stroke, abolish the spoils system, but the intervening 84 years have produced, first, a steady increase in the number of Government positions covered by civil service, and, second, a constant improvement of the benefits to those covered by the system.

In 1888, President Cleveland added 5,300 positions of the railway mail service to coverage by the classified system. In succeeding years, the Indian Service, the Fish Commission, additional post offices, and the Weather Bureau were "blanketed in." President Theodore Roosevelt, himself a Civil Service Commissioner, was a staunch advocate of civil service reform. By the end of his administration as President, the percentage of Federal positions placed on a competitive basis was 63.9 percent—contrasted to the 10.5 percent which were covered by the original act. The trend has continued steadily, spurred on by the demands of the great depression, World War II, governments and the expanded postwar programs in space, the military, and welfare. Today, over two and a half million persons have received and maintained their appointments to Government service under the basic rules formulated by the act of 1883.

Employee benefits, too, have kept pace. In the last decade alone, seven pieces of legislation providing for increased salary scales for Federal employees have been enacted. To encourage and maintain the finest possible talents in Government service, the pay must be at least competitive with that in the private sector of our economy.

Programs of health and life insurance and a retirement system have been added for the protection of Government employees. On-the-job training programs, incentive programs, equal opportunity for all regardless of race, creed, or sex—these are all positive concepts which we take for granted today, but which have taken years of the combined efforts of many people to accomplish.

As Government employees, you here this evening represent a corps of the best trained, best qualified—and, I might add, enjoy more benefits—of any group of people which has ever served the U.S. Government. However, the job is not finished. It will take the continued efforts of all of us to insure that the Government service continues to be the proud profession it is today. The critical and ever-increasing demands made upon the Federal Government in this revolutionary age can be met only if the ablest and most competent and dedicated people can be attracted and retained in the Government service. And that is our charge—to protect and improve the system of merit which has taken so many years to accomplish.

EQUAL EMPLOYMENT OPPORTUNITY AMENDMENTS OF 1967

Mr. STUCKEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Texas [Mr. WHITE] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Georgia?

There was no objection.

Mr. WHITE. Mr. Speaker, this country was forged by the efforts of many peoples. Our Nation continues to be strengthened today by the amalgamation of peoples of many national origins. Our Constitution and Declaration of Independence recognize the value of all

peoples and provide that each individual shall have the same opportunity to pursue the American dream. Crucial among the rights of each American is the equal opportunity to be productive and successful in his labors.

We have become aware that this equal opportunity of employment has not always been afforded to every group of citizens of the United States. The Congress recognizing this national shortcoming and seeking to correct it, created the Equal Employment Opportunity Commission in the Civil Rights Act of 1964. The Commission was designed to study problems of minority groups in securing equal employment opportunity and eliminate all discrimination specified by the act.

However, even in the establishment and operation of this agency of Government, there has been practiced an unconscious discrimination by excluding from the membership of this Commission representation and understanding of one of the principal minority groups of our country—those of our good Americans who are of Mexican descent.

These Americans seek and deserve the opportunity to fully participate in the work and advancement of our Nation. Their dedication to American ideals has been demonstrated again and again. Just one, but a very important example is their dedication to the defense of our country. It is well known that the rolls of honor of those killed in military action and those wounded in service to their country have a high percentage of Americans of Mexican descent. Eleven Congressional Medals of Honor for World War II and six for the Korean conflict were awarded to citizens of Mexican descent. Today in Vietnam members of this group continue to heroically defend our national interests.

These American citizens do not fail to rise to the needs of their country and their country must not fail to understand their needs.

Therefore, I have this day introduced a bill which calls for expansion by two members of the Equal Employment Opportunity Commission. The legislation expressly states that the introduction is to further eliminate discrimination in employment opportunities wherever it exists and to insure a full understanding of the problems of the citizens of the United States of Mexican descent.

The bill states that in making appointments to the Commission the President shall give due consideration, among other reasonable factors, to whether there is maximum feasible representation provided among the membership of the Commission for persons of all the various groups throughout the Nation, including large, identifiable, cohesive groups of national origin who as a minority group possess particular problems pertinent to the purposes of this act.

With the passage of this bill and the inclusion of an American of Mexican descent on the Equal Employment Opportunity Commission I am confident that this group of Americans will be able to add even greater strength to our Nation and more fully share in our successes.

PROPOSAL FOR NEW U.S. MINT IN CHICAGO

Mr. STUCKEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. ANNUNZIO] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Georgia?

There was no objection.

Mr. ANNUNZIO. Mr. Speaker, today I introduced a bill to provide for the establishment of a U.S. Mint in Chicago, Ill. I am inserting into the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD a press release which was issued from my office today in order to explain to my colleagues in the House the merits and the need for this legislation.

My press release follows:

CONGRESSMAN ANNUNZIO PROPOSES NEW U.S. MINT IN CHICAGO

Congressman Frank Annunzio, Democrat, of Chicago, a member of the House of Representatives Committee on Banking and Currency, has introduced legislation in the new Congress to construct a United States Mint in Chicago.

The legislation would authorize construction of a Chicago Mint to supplement the ultra-modern \$37,000,000 Mint now being built at Philadelphia—the only Mint of its type currently authorized by law.

In addition to the old Philadelphia Mint that is soon to be replaced, other Mint facilities are operated at Denver and San Francisco. The Denver Mint would need extensive remodeling and expansion to meet future Mint requirements, Mr. Annunzio said, while the San Francisco operation—closed down during the Eisenhower Administration but re-opened in 1965 to meet heavy coinage demand—is legally authorized to continue as a temporary facility only until the coin shortage is completely overcome.

"Chicago is the perfect location for the kind of Mint this country will need for the coming decades," Congressman Annunzio declared. "Most of our coinage demand is in the area of the country east of the Mississippi. Thus, a Mint located in Chicago could ship coins into that area as needed to supplement Philadelphia supplies, and to all parts of the country, from a central and economical location. Transportation costs are a tremendous factor in coin distribution, and Chicago's unequaled transportation facilities, as well as its strategic location, make it the perfect site for a second jet-age Mint."

In introducing his bill, Congressman Annunzio conceded that Western State Members of Congress will undoubtedly fight hard to keep their present Mint facilities in operation indefinitely, and to expand their production capabilities. He said there would probably be good reasons for retaining the older coinage equipment, at least on stand-by, even if a second ultramodern Mint is built at Chicago "because no one knows what future needs of the economy may be for coins in the operation of automatic vending equipment of all kinds."

"The abandonment of the San Francisco Mint was a big mistake a decade ago," he said. "When we needed its production in these last few years, to meet unprecedented coin demands, the equipment just wasn't there, and it took great imagination and enterprise to find usable presses and other machinery."

MORE COINS NEEDED

"I look forward confidently to a steadily expanding American economy, bringing more of the good things of life to more Americans. This will mean ever-greater use of coins to

speed the flow of commerce. Extensively rebuilding the Denver Mint to make it more efficient would undoubtedly not be nearly as economic and practical as building a completely new plant—one which I hope to see come to Chicago."

Representative Annunzio, as a member of the Banking and Currency Committee, helped to shape the final form of the Coinage Act of 1965 which met a crisis in the world-wide silver supply shortage by authorizing new types of dimes, quarters and half-dollars using little or no silver. This law also authorized temporary resumption of coinage operations at the San Francisco Assay Office (the old Mint). The 1965 Act furthermore substantially increased the authorized ceiling on construction costs of the new Philadelphia Mint to permit installation of equipment necessary to handle all phases of the production of the new "clad" coins. At present, the bonded copper-nickel cladding on a copper base, used in the dime and quarter, and the copper-silver alloys used in the "sandwich" half-dollars must be purchased in strip form from private industry.

In the course of the development of the legislation which became the Coinage Act of 1965, Congressman Annunzio made a personal inspection of the old Philadelphia Mint leading to further study of the coinage needs which in turn led to his introduction of the bill to establish the world's most modern Mint in Chicago.

Although Congressman Annunzio's Committee handles all legislation dealing with coinage policy matters, the bill for a new Mint has been assigned under House rules to the Committee on Public Works, which has jurisdiction over all legislative proposals for construction of new public buildings. Mr. Annunzio said he will pursue every avenue for expediting the bill's consideration by the latter Committee, while utilizing his position on the Banking and Currency Committee to develop the facts pointing to the advantages of a Chicago location.

A LETTER TO A BOY IN VIETNAM

Mr. STUCKEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Florida [Mr. PEPPER] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Georgia?

There was no objection.

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. Speaker, in this time of crisis and conflict in Vietnam we seldom read or hear a statement of compassion and understanding for the soldier who is carrying out the policies of this country in defending freedom against communistic aggression. This dirty war in Vietnam is on everyone's mind nowadays but I would like to call to my colleagues attention an editorial broadcast over WTVJ, channel 4, in Miami, by Mr. Ralph Renick.

Mr. Renick is a leading figure in the community in the south Florida area and WTVJ is one of the outstanding TV stations of its kind in the South. Ralph Renick is a past president of Radio TV News Directors Association. His thought-projecting editorial on this past Christmas Eve made many of us stop and think and pay tribute, as well as thanks, to those boys who are risking their lives so that we can enjoy a happy and prosperous Christmas with our loved ones.

Mr. Speaker I include Mr. Renick's editorial "A Letter to a Boy in Vietnam" at this point in the Record:

A LETTER TO A BOY IN VIETNAM

We have a letter from Mrs. Amber Mary Scott. She says her grandson James Donaldson is serving in Vietnam with an Air Force group setting up radio and TV stations there.

Mrs. Scott says after hearing and reading reports of our boys in the mud in Viet Nam she wondered what we could do to let them know we appreciate what they are doing for us and our country.

Mrs. Scott asks that I write a few words to Jim that he can read over the air to those lonely men so far from home.

Well Mrs. Scott this is not an easy assignment but I'll do the best I can. Here are a few words which I hope please you and Jim.

"DEAR JIM: Your grandmother has written to me suggesting that perhaps during this season when everybody seems so intent on forgetting their troubles that I write to you in Viet Nam. I'll be honest, it's difficult to write these words from the comfort and safety here at home to someone who's got his life on the line every minute performing the hardest, roughest job in the world.

"I'm sure you know that those closest to you, your parents, grandparents, brothers, sisters, and sweethearts have their hearts with you this Christmas season as they do all the time, but maybe you'd be surprised to know that a lot of other citizens are thinking of you, too. You are not being taken for granted.

"My children are too young to be touched by this unhappy, dirty war in which you and your buddies are risking your lives but like most other parents I can imagine my feelings if my boy was serving in Viet Nam.

"This nation has never been quick to make war. Our citizen soldiers have always longed for home, not the battlefield. But since this country was founded it has been men like you that have preserved our heritage and made possible peace and freedom. Tomorrow it might be my boy doing the fighting.

"Forget what you hear about pickets and protests, the fact remains that all of us are aware of the debt we owe you. A debt we can never repay.

"I just hope that next Christmas we will have an honorable peace in Viet Nam and you'll be back here for the holidays.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to Mr. PEPPER (at the request of Mr. ALBERT), for today, on account of official business.

SPECIAL ORDERS GRANTED

By unanimous consent, permission to address the House, following the legislative program and any special orders heretofore entered, was granted to:

Mr. MONAGAN, for 1 hour, on January 17, and to revise and extend his remarks and include extraneous matter.

Mr. HALL, for 40 minutes, on Tuesday, January 17, and to revise and extend his remarks and include extraneous matter.

Mr. GROSS, for 30 minutes, today.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

By unanimous consent, permission to extend remarks in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, or to revise and extend remarks was granted to:

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. ARENDS) and to include extraneous matter:)

Mr. STEIGER of Wisconsin.

Mr. MAILLIARD.

Mr. LIPSCOMB.

(The following Member (at the request of Mr. STUCKEY) and to include extraneous matter:)

Mr. BINGHAM.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. STUCKEY. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 12 o'clock and 26 minutes p.m.), the House adjourned until tomorrow, Tuesday, January 17, 1967, at 12 o'clock noon.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

199. A letter from the vice president, Chesapeake & Potomac Telephone Co., transmitting the annual report of the Chesapeake & Potomac Telephone Co. for the year 1966; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

200. A letter from the President, Board of Commissioners, District of Columbia, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to amend section 6 of the District of Columbia Traffic Act, 1925, as amended, and to amend section 6 of the act approved July 2, 1940, as amended, to eliminate requirements that applications for motor vehicle title certificates and certain lien information related thereto be submitted under oath; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

201. A letter from the President, Board of Commissioners, District of Columbia, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to amend the Healing Arts Practice Act, District of Columbia, 1928, as amended, and the act for the regulation of the practice of dentistry in the District of Columbia, and for the protection of the people from empiricism in relation thereto, approved June 6, 1892, as amended, to exempt from licensing thereunder physicians and dentists employed by the District of Columbia; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

202. A letter from the President, Board of Commissioners, District of Columbia, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to amend the act entitled "An act to regulate the practice of podiatry in the District of Columbia"; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

203. A letter from the President, Board of Commissioners, District of Columbia, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to amend the District of Columbia Traffic Act, 1925, as amended, and the Motor Vehicle Safety Responsibility Act of the District of Columbia, as amended, so as to bring within the provisions of such acts any person operating a motor vehicle while under the influence of a drug rendering such person incapable of operating the motor vehicle safely; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

204. A letter from the President, Board of Commissioners, District of Columbia, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to amend the District of Columbia Traffic Act, 1925, as amended; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

205. A letter from the President, Board of Commissioners, District of Columbia, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to provide for the registration of names assumed for the purposes of trade or business in the District of Columbia; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

206. A letter from the President, Board of Commissioners, District of Columbia, trans-

mitting a draft of proposed legislation to amend the act entitled "An act to provide for compulsory school attendance, for the taking of a school census in the District of Columbia, and for other purposes," approved February 4, 1915; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

207. A letter from the President, Board of Commissioners, District of Columbia, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to amend an act to provide for the establishment of a public crematorium in the District of Columbia; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

208. A letter from the President, Board of Commissioners, District of Columbia, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to amend the act approved August 17, 1937, so as to facilitate the addition to the District of Columbia registration of a motor vehicle or trailer of the name of the spouse of the owner of any such motor vehicle or trailer; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

209. A letter from the President, Board of Commissioners, District of Columbia, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to amend the act entitled "An act to provide for the annual inspection of all motor vehicles in the District of Columbia," approved February 18, 1938, as amended; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

210. A letter from the President, Board of Commissioners, District of Columbia, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to amend the District of Columbia Traffic Act, 1925, as amended; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

211. A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting the annual report on the activities of the U.S. General Accounting Office during the fiscal year ended June 30, 1966, pursuant to the provisions of section 312(a) of the Budget and Accounting Act of 1921; to the Committee on Government Operations.

212. A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting a report of need for prompt adjustment in compensation payments to injured Federal employees from total to partial disability rates, Bureau of Employees' Compensation, Department of Labor; to the Committee on Government Operations.

213. A letter from the Secretary of Commerce, transmitting the ninth semiannual report on the activities of the U.S. Travel Service, pursuant to the provisions of section 5 of the International Travel Act of 1961; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

214. A letter from the Chairman, Federal Maritime Commission, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to amend section 27 of the Shipping Act, 1916; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

215. A letter from the Assistant Administrator for Legislative Affairs, National Aeronautics and Space Administration, transmitting a report with respect to certain civilian positions established, pursuant to the provisions of section 1581, title 10, United States Code; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

216. A letter from the Librarian of Congress, transmitting a report of positions in the Library of Congress in grades GS-16, GS-17, and GS-18, pursuant to the provisions of Public Law 89-632; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

217. A letter from the Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting a proposal to increase the debt limit; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

218. A letter from the Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to establish a working capital fund for the Department of the Treasury; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. BERRY:

H.R. 2289. A bill to amend title 32, United States Code, to clarify the status of National Guard technicians, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. BLATNIK:

H.R. 2290. A bill granting the consent of Congress to a Great Lakes Basin compact, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. BROWN of California:

H.R. 2291. A bill to provide for the establishment of a national cemetery in Los Angeles County in the State of California; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

H.R. 2292. A bill to amend title 38 of the United States Code in order to establish in the Veterans' Administration a national veterans' cemetery system consisting of all cemeteries of the United States in which veterans of any war or conflict are or may be buried; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

H.R. 2293. A bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to establish a Court of Veterans' Appeals and to prescribe its jurisdiction and functions; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

H.R. 2294. A bill to amend the veterans' educational assistance program of title 38 of the United States Code so as to increase the amount of educational assistance allowances payable to veterans to include flight training in such program, to provide additional readjustment assistance for veterans of service after January 31, 1955, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. BURKE of Massachusetts:

H.R. 2295. A bill to extend to nonprofit retirement organizations certain third-class mailing privileges; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

H.R. 2296. A bill to modify the decrease in group life insurance at age 65 or after retirement; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

H.R. 2297. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 with respect to the income tax treatment of business development corporations; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 2298. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to allow a credit against income tax to individuals for certain expenses incurred in providing higher education; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 2299. A bill to amend the tariff schedules of the United States with respect to the rates of duty on certain fabrics containing wool and silk; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. CABELL:

H.R. 2300. A bill to amend title 18 of the United States Code to prohibit travel or use of any facility in interstate or foreign commerce with intent to incite a riot or other violent civil disturbance, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CEDERBERG:

H.R. 2301. A bill to provide for the issuance of a volunteer's medal to each individual who enlists in the Armed Forces of the United States during a period of war or armed conflict involving the United States; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. CLARK:

H.R. 2302. A bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to provide payment for optometrists' services under the program of supplementary medical insurance benefits for the aged; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. CRAMER:

H.R. 2303. A bill to provide that the high-

way running from Tampa, Fla., and St. Petersburg, Fla., through Bradenton, Fla., Sarasota, Fla., Venice, Fla., Punta Gorda, Fla., Fort Myers, Fla., Naples, Fla., and Miami, Fla., to Fort Lauderdale, Fla., and Homestead, Fla., shall be a part of the National System of Interstate and Defense Highways; to the Committee on Public Works.

H.R. 2304. A bill to amend section 129(b) of title 23, United States Code, relating to toll roads, bridges, and tunnels on the National System of Interstate and Defense Highways; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. EDWARDS of California:

H.R. 2305. A bill to abolish the death penalty under all laws of the United States, and authorize the imposition of life imprisonment in lieu thereof, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. FINO:

H.R. 2306. A bill to provide for Federal lotteries to raise funds to provide for a reduction in the national debt and a reduction in the Federal individual income taxes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. FULTON of Pennsylvania:

H.R. 2307. A bill to reclassify certain positions in the postal field service, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

H.R. 2308. A bill to provide for improved employee-management relations in the Federal service, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. GALLAGHER:

H.R. 2309. A bill to provide that Interstate Route No. 80 shall be known as the 80th Division Memorial Highway; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. HORTON:

H.R. 2310. A bill to exclude from income certain reimbursed moving expenses; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. MOSS:

H.R. 2311. A bill to amend the Federal Power Act so as to require Federal Power Commission authority for the construction, extension, or operation of certain facilities for the transmission of electric energy in interstate commerce; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. MULTER:

H.R. 2312. A bill to amend the Housing Act of 1949 to provide that the full cost of opening, widening, and improving streets along the boundary of an urban renewal project shall be includible as a part of the local grant-in-aid for such project; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

H.R. 2313. A bill to amend the National Housing Act to fix the premium for the insurance of cooperative housing mortgages at the minimum permissible level (one-fourth of 1 percent per annum); to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

H.R. 2314. A bill to amend section 608 of the National Housing Act to prevent the charging of excessive rents, resulting from unduly high estimates of costs, in the case of property covered by a mortgage insured under such section; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

H.R. 2315. A bill to provide all citizens of the District of Columbia, particularly its low- and moderate-income families, equal access to and participation in the arts by establishing neighborhood art centers and supporting neighborhood advisory and working art groups, and by providing greater support for the National Symphony Orchestra, the Corcoran Gallery of Art, the Children's Theater, and other nonprofit art programs of the District of Columbia; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

H.R. 2316. A bill relating to the establishment of parking facilities in the District of Columbia; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

H.R. 2317. A bill relating to the practice of

law in the District of Columbia; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

H.R. 2318. A bill to amend the District of Columbia Alcoholic Beverage Control Act to prohibit false advertising in the District of Columbia relating to alcoholic beverages; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

H.R. 2319. A bill to amend the District of Columbia Income and Franchise Tax Act of 1947 with respect to the deduction of medical expenses; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

H.R. 2320. A bill to amend the act of October 13, 1964, to regulate the location of chanceries and other business offices of foreign governments in the District of Columbia; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

H.R. 2321. A bill to provide for the establishment of a municipal arts council representative of local nonprofit organizations and institutions, including educational organizations and institutions, in the District of Columbia with active programs in the arts, to set aside for such local cultural activities 1 mill out of each \$1 of tax revenue of the government of the District of Columbia, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

H.R. 2322. A bill to authorize the Commissioners of the District of Columbia to acquire, contract, operate, and regulate a public offstreet parking facility; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

H.R. 2323. A bill to amend the District of Columbia Redevelopment Act of 1945; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

H.R. 2324. A bill to amend the District of Columbia Alcoholic Beverage Control Act to prohibit the sales of alcoholic beverages to persons under 21 years of age; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

H.R. 2325. A bill to require the registration of pistols in the District of Columbia, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

H.R. 2326. A bill to amend the District of Columbia Alcoholic Beverage Control Act for the purpose of prohibiting certain sales below cost; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

H.R. 2327. A bill to amend the District of Columbia Alcoholic Beverage Control Act for the purpose of prohibiting certain sales below cost; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

H.R. 2328. A bill to provide certain incentives for the repair, improvement, renovation, and restoration of residential and commercial property under the tax laws of the District of Columbia, to provide that existing housing in urban renewal areas in the District of Columbia shall be rehabilitated, restored, and preserved in all possible cases, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

H.R. 2329. A bill to require proof of financial security with respect to each person who registers a motor vehicle in the District of Columbia, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

H.R. 2330. A bill to amend the act of July 8, 1932, relating to the control or possession in the District of Columbia of dangerous weapons, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

H.R. 2331. A bill to amend the District of Columbia Redevelopment Act of 1945, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

H.R. 2332. A bill to amend the District of Columbia Alcoholic Beverage Control Act; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

H.R. 2333. A bill to promote safe driving and eliminate the reckless and irresponsible driver from the streets and highways of the District of Columbia by providing that any person operating a motor vehicle within the District while apparently under the influence of intoxicating liquor shall be deemed

to have given his consent to a chemical test of certain of his body substances to determine the alcoholic content of his blood, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

H.R. 2334. A bill to provide for increased Federal Government participation in meeting the costs of maintaining the Nation's Capital City and to authorize Federal loans to the District of Columbia for capital improvement programs; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

H.R. 2335. A bill to amend the act of July 8, 1932 (relating to dangerous weapons in the District of Columbia), to create a presumption in connection with the possession of certain dangerous weapons; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

H.R. 2336. A bill to amend the District of Columbia Income and Franchise Tax Act of 1947 to provide an exemption for students, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

H.R. 2337. A bill to license and regulate private employment agencies in the District of Columbia; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

H.R. 2338. A bill to permit certain proceedings supplementary to judgment in the U.S. District Court for the District of Columbia and in the municipal court for the District of Columbia; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

H.R. 2339. A bill to amend the District of Columbia Alcoholic Beverage Control Act to prohibit certain advertising with respect to price, and to prohibit false advertising in the District of Columbia relating to alcoholic beverages; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

H.R. 2340. A bill to amend the Federal Employees' Compensation Act to extend coverage to certain persons engaged in civil defense; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

H.R. 2341. A bill to amend the National Defense Education Act of 1958 to provide for a college scholarship program; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

H.R. 2342. A bill to encourage and promote the establishment of an Inter-American Court of Justice; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

H.R. 2343. A bill to amend the International Peace and Security Act of 1961 to provide for the establishment and support of a Western Hemisphere Police Force; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

H.R. 2344. A bill to create a National Peace Agency and to prescribe its functions; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

H.R. 2345. A bill to establish a Foreign Service Officers' Training Corps; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

H.R. 2346. A bill to amend the Hatch Act to permit all officers and employees of the Government to exercise the full responsibility of citizenship and to take an active part in the political life of the United States; to the Committee on House Administration.

H.R. 2347. A bill to amend the Public Health Service Act to provide for the establishment of a National Eye Institute in the National Institutes of Health; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

H.R. 2348. A bill to amend the Federal Trade Commission Act to strengthen independent competitive enterprise by providing for fair competitive acts, practices, and methods of competition, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

H.R. 2349. A bill to designate the Tuesday next after the first Monday in November in every even numbered year as election day and to make it a legal public holiday; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 2350. A bill to amend the Immigration and Nationality Act to provide that clergymen who are naturalized citizens shall not lose their nationality by residence abroad, even though they are not representa-

tives of American organizations, if they devote full time to their clerical duties, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 2351. A bill to amend the Immigration and Nationality Act to impose a limitation upon the time for the institution of deportation proceedings, and a limitation upon the time for the loss of U.S. nationality; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 2352. A bill to amend the Immigration and Nationality Act; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 2353. A bill to amend the act of August 11, 1939, relating to domestically produced fishery products to establish a fund for the advancement of commercial fisheries; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

H.R. 2354. A bill to amend the Civil Service Retirement Act to increase to 2½ percent the multiplication factor for determining annuities for certain Federal employees engaged in hazardous duties; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

H.R. 2355. A bill to provide that certain Government officers and employees shall be excused from duty for a sufficient period of time to vote in elections; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

H.R. 2356. A bill to amend the Classification Act of 1949, as amended, so as to authorize longevity step increases for officers and employees in grades above grade 15 of the general schedule; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

H.R. 2357. A bill to amend the Civil Service Retirement Act to authorize retirement without reduction in annuity of employees with 20 years of service involuntarily separated from the service by reason of the abolition or relocation of their employment; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

H.R. 2358. A bill to extend the benefits of the Retired Federal Employees Health Benefits Act in certain cases; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

H.R. 2359. A bill to provide for the separation from the service of certain Government employees who have unpaid judgments against them, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

H.R. 2360. A bill to authorize the retirement under the Civil Service Retirement Act, without reduction in annuity and regardless of age, of employees who have completed 30 years of service; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

H.R. 2361. A bill to provide a retroactive effective date of July 1, 1965, for the severance pay provisions in section 9 of the Federal Employees Salary Act of 1965 so as to extend the application of such provisions; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

H.R. 2362. A bill to provide coverage under the old-age, survivors, and disability insurance system (subject to an election in the case of those currently serving) for all officers and employees of the United States and its instrumentalities; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. NATCHER:

H.R. 2363. A bill to extend veteran benefits to persons serving in the Armed Forces between November 12, 1918, and July 2, 1921; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. O'NEAL of Georgia:

H.R. 2364. A bill to prohibit desecration of the flag; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. PERKINS:

H.R. 2365. A bill to increase educational opportunities throughout the Nation by providing grants for the construction of elementary and secondary schools and supplemental educational centers and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

H.R. 2366. A bill to amend the Vocational Education Act of 1963; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

H.R. 2367. A bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act to increase all benefits thereunder by 15 percent and to provide that full benefits (when based on attainment of retirement age) will be payable to both men and women at age 60, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 2368. A bill to provide that individuals entitled to disability insurance benefits (or child's benefits based on disability) under title II of the Social Security Act, and individuals entitled to permanent disability annuities (or child's annuities based on disability) under the Railroad Retirement Act of 1937, shall be eligible for health insurance benefits under title XVIII of the Social Security Act; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. RODINO:

H.R. 2369. A bill creating a commission to be known as the Commission on Noxious and Obscene Matters and Materials; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

H.R. 2370. A bill to provide for a comprehensive review of national water resource problems and programs, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

H.R. 2371. A bill to strengthen the criminal penalties for the mailing, importing, or transporting of obscene matter, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 2372. A bill declaring October 12 to be a legal holiday; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 2373. A bill to require mailing list brokers to register with the Postmaster General, and suppliers and buyers of mailing lists to furnish information to the Postmaster General with respect to their identity and transactions involving the sale or exchange of mailing lists, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. ROSENTHAL:

H.R. 2374. A bill to establish a National Consumer Information Foundation as an independent agency in the executive branch of the Federal Government; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. STUBBLEFIELD:

H.R. 2375. A bill to amend the Food and Agriculture Act of 1965; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. TUNNEY:

H.R. 2376. A bill to amend title 10, United States Code, to equalize the retirement pay of members of the uniformed services of equal rank and years of service, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

H.R. 2377. A bill designating the fourth Friday in September of each year as National Indian Day; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 2378. A bill to extend preferential postage rates to qualifying museums for the mailing of educational materials, loan exhibits, and other materials; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

H.R. 2379. A bill to provide for the construction of a Veterans' Administration hospital of 1,000 beds in the Riverside-San Bernardino area of the State of California; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

H.R. 2380. A bill to amend section 170(c) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to provide a deduction from gross income for contributions and gifts to or for the use of certain conservation organizations; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 2381. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to provide that construction workers shall be allowed the deduction for moving expenses without regard to the length of time they are employed at their new location; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Mr. ZABLOCKI:

H.R. 2382. A bill to require mailing list

brokers to register with the Postmaster General, and suppliers and buyers of mailing lists to furnish information to the Postmaster General with respect to their identity and transactions involving the sale or exchange of mailing lists, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

H.R. 2383. A bill to authorize on-the-job training and apprenticeship programs under the veterans' educational assistance program embodied in title 38 of the United States Code; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. ANNUNZIO:

H.R. 2384. A bill to authorize and request the President to award a Presidential Unit Citation to the 761st Tank Battalion; to the Committee on Armed Services.

H.R. 2385. A bill to exclude from income certain reimbursed moving expenses; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 2386. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to allow a deduction, for income tax purposes, based on expenses incurred by the taxpayer for the higher education of his children; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. ASHMORE:

H.R. 2387. A bill to revise the Federal election laws, and for other purposes; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. DENNEY:

H.R. 2388. A bill to provide for an extension of Interstate Highway 29 into Nebraska, including a bridge; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. ESHLEMAN:

H.R. 2389. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to allow a credit against income tax to individuals for certain expenses incurred in providing higher education; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. FISHER:

H.R. 2390. A bill to strengthen democratic processes respecting the calling of strikes, to protect employees against unjustifiable pay losses from strikes, to protect employers from needless production interruptions arising out of strikes contrary to the wishes of employees, and to minimize industrial strife interfering with the flow of commerce and the national security by amending the National Labor Relations Act to require economic strikes to be authorized by a secret ballot; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

H.R. 2391. A bill to limit and prevent certain concerted activities by labor organizations which interfere with or obstruct or impede the free production of goods for commerce or the free flow thereof in commerce, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

H.R. 2392. A bill to create a new division for the western district of Texas, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 2393. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to provide that the value of a decedent's real property (or interest in real property) which was used as a ranch or farm or in some other trade or business may at the election of the executor be determined, for estate tax purposes, solely by reference to its value for such use; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. GIAIMO:

H.R. 2394. A bill to amend section 501 of title 38, United States Code, to provide that under certain conditions, service on the Mexican border before World War I may be included in determining whether a veteran meets the service requirements applicable to the payment of pension; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. GURNEY:

H.R. 2395. A bill to amend title 38 of the United States Code so as to increase by 10 percent the rate of pension payable to

certain widows of veterans of World War I, World War II, and the Korean conflict, and to increase the income limitations applicable with respect to the payment of such pensions; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

H.R. 2396. A bill to amend title 38 of the United States Code so as to raise the income limitations applicable with respect to pensions payable under that title; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. HICKS:

H.R. 2397. A bill to amend title 10, United States Code, to provide that members of the Armed Forces shall be retired in the highest grade satisfactorily held in any armed force, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

H.R. 2398. A bill to amend the Older Americans Act of 1965 to provide for a National Community Senior Service Corps; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. HUTCHINSON:

H.R. 2399. A bill to amend the provisions of the Criminal Code relating to kidnapping to relieve juries of the duty of deciding whether the death sentence should be imposed; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. KING of New York:

H.R. 2400. A bill to increase the personal income tax exemption of a taxpayer and the additional exemption for his spouse from \$600 to \$1,000, and to increase the exemption for a dependent from \$600 to \$1,000; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. MACHEN:

H.R. 2401. A bill to amend the Older Americans Act of 1965 to provide for a National Community Senior Service Corps; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

H.R. 2402. A bill to require the Secretary of the Army to remove certain abandoned ships from the Potomac River; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. MULTER:

H.R. 2403. A bill to authorize the Board of Commissioners of the District of Columbia to acquire, transfer, convey, and lease certain property in the District of Columbia for use as a headquarters site for the Organization of American States, as sites for other international organizations, and as sites for governments of foreign countries, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. RHODES of Arizona:

H.R. 2404. A bill to amend the act of May 11, 1954 (ch. 199, sec. 1, 68 Stat. 81, 41 U.S.C. 321), to provide for full adjudication of rights of Government contractors in courts of law; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SIKES:

H.R. 2405. A bill to authorize a preliminary hearing and survey to determine the justification for a small boat channel from Santa Rosa Sound to the Gulf of Mexico in the vicinity of Fort Walton Beach, Fla.; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. SMITH of New York:

H.R. 2406. A bill to amend the tariff schedules of the United States to allow containers for certain petroleum products and derivatives to be temporarily imported without payment of duty; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. UTT:

H.R. 2407. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to encourage the construction of facilities to control water and air pollution by allowing a tax credit for expenditures incurred in constructing such facilities and by permitting the deduction or amortization over a period of 1 to 5 years, of such expenditures; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. WALKER:

H.R. 2408. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to allow teachers to deduct from gross income the expenses incurred in pursuing courses for academic credit and degrees at institutions of higher

education and including certain travel; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. WHITTEN:

H.R. 2409. A bill to permit the disposal of certain Federal real property for use for educational purposes; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

H.R. 2410. A bill to amend title 18 of the United States Code to prohibit travel or use of any facility in interstate or foreign commerce with intent to incite a riot or other violent civil disturbance, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 2411. A bill to provide for determination through judicial proceedings of claims for compensation on account of disability or death resulting from disease or injury incurred or aggravated in line of duty while serving in the active military or naval service, including those who served during peacetime, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

H.R. 2412. A bill to protect funds invested in series E U.S. savings bonds from inflation and to encourage persons to provide for their own security; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 2413. A bill to amend title IV of the Social Security Act to permit Federal grants for aid to dependent children to be made thereunder even though the parents or other relatives with whom such children are living are required to perform services in a work relief program as a condition of such aid; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 2414. A bill to increase the personal tax exemptions of a single taxpayer or head of household from \$600 to \$1,200; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 2415. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to exempt certain farm vehicles from the highway use tax; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 2416. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to allow a taxpayer a deduction from gross income for tuition and other educational expenses paid by him, whether for his own education or for the education of his spouse or a dependent or any other individual; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. WYATT:

H.R. 2417. A bill to conserve and protect Pacific salmon of North American origin; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. HELSTOSKI:

H.R. 2418. A bill to assist in the promotion of economic stabilization by requiring the disclosure of finance charges in connection with extension of credit; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. MAILLIARD:

H.R. 2419. A bill to prevent vessels built or rebuilt outside the United States or documented under foreign registry from carrying cargoes restricted to vessels of the United States; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. PATMAN:

H.R. 2420. A bill fixing the representation of the majority and minority membership of the Joint Economic Committee; to the Committee on Government Operations.

By Mr. PELL:

H.R. 2421. A bill to prevent vessels built or rebuilt outside the United States or documented under foreign registry from carrying cargoes restricted to vessels of the United States; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. SIKES:

H.R. 2422. A bill to authorize the establishment of the Biscayne National Monument in the State of Florida, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

H.R. 2423. A bill for the relief of the living descendants of the Creek Nation of 1814; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. TUCK:

H.R. 2424. A bill to authorize the preparation of plans for a memorial to Woodrow Wilson; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. TUNNEY:

H.R. 2425. A bill to grant, subject to certain conditions, a preference right of reentry under the desert land laws to entrymen, their heirs or assigns, with desert land entries within the Imperial Irrigation and Coachella Valley County Water Districts, where such entries have been canceled subsequent to December 1, 1965; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. WHITE:

H.R. 2426. A bill to amend section 705 of the Civil Rights Act of 1964 in order to increase the membership of the Equal Employment Opportunity Commission from five members to seven members, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. WHITTEN:

H.R. 2427. A bill to authorize an additional 41,000 miles for the National System of Interstate and Defense Highways; to the Committee on Public Works.

H.R. 2428. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code to remove the limitations on the amount of medical and dental expenses which may be deducted, to permit taxpayers to deduct such expenses, to arrive at their adjusted gross income, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 2429. A bill to provide aid to States for roads and schools; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. WILLIS:

H.R. 2430. A bill to amend section 215 of the Immigration and Nationality Act; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ASHBROOK:

H.R. 2431. A bill to amend section 215 of the Immigration and Nationality Act; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ANNUNZIO:

H.R. 2432. A bill to provide for the establishment of a mint of the United States at Chicago, Ill.; to the Committee on Public Works.

H.J. Res. 131. Joint resolution to authorize the President to issue annually a proclamation designating the first week in November of each year as American Art Week; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BERRY:

H.J. Res. 132. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States relative to the balancing of the budget; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. EDWARDS of California:

H.J. Res. 133. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States relative to equal rights for men and women; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. FEIGHAN:

H.J. Res. 134. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States providing that citizens 18 years old or members of the Armed Forces of the United States shall not be prevented from voting in certain elections on grounds of their age; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. FULTON of Pennsylvania:

H.J. Res. 135. Joint resolution to authorize the President to proclaim the 22d of April of each year as Queen Isabella Day; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. OLSEN:

H.J. Res. 136. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States to provide that the right to vote shall not be denied on account of age to persons who are 18 years of age or older; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ROBERTS:

H.J. Res. 137. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States to permit voluntary partici-

pation in prayer in public schools; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. RODINO:

H.J. Res. 138. Joint resolution to authorize the President to designate October 31 of each year as National UNICEF Day; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ROYBAL:

H.J. Res. 139. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States relative to equal rights for men and women; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. TEAGUE of California:

H.J. Res. 140. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States relative to equal rights for men and women; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. TUNNEY:

H.J. Res. 141. Joint resolution to authorize the President to proclaim the second week of November 1967, as National Date Week; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WHITTEN:

H.J. Res. 142. Joint resolution to establish a commission to investigate the increase in riots and law violations, including loss of life and property, damage to or threat of damage to or destruction of the economy of States, counties, municipalities, or other political subdivisions, the causes thereof, and to recommend legislation that would grant States, counties, municipalities, or other political subdivisions additional rights to obtain injunctive and other relief to the end that the public welfare be protected; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.J. Res. 143. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States providing for the election of President and Vice President; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.J. Res. 144. Joint resolution to establish the Commission for Reestablishing Constitutional Principles; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.J. Res. 145. Joint resolution to establish a commission to investigate the increase in law violation, to determine the causes and fix responsibility for the breakdown in law enforcement, with the resulting destruction of life and property, to recommend corrective legislation, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.J. Res. 146. Joint resolution providing that the United States shall not participate in any civil action except as a party to such civil action; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.J. Res. 147. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution relating to the terms of office of judges of the Supreme Court of the United States and inferior courts; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.J. Res. 148. Joint resolution to restore to the States certain rights affected by recent Supreme Court decisions; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.J. Res. 149. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.J. Res. 150. Joint resolution to amend the Constitution of the United States to guarantee the right of any State to apportion one house of its legislature on factors other than population; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. YOUNGER:

H.J. Res. 151. Joint resolution to provide for the resumption of trade with Rhodesia; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. YOUNGER (by request):

H.J. Res. 152. Joint resolution designating the Luther Burbank Shasta Daisy as the national flower of the United States; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. FLYNT:

H. Con. Res. 63. Concurrent resolution expressing the sense of Congress that the Fed-

eral-aid highway program should continue without interruption; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. HORTON:

H. Con. Res. 64. Concurrent resolution expressing the sense of the Congress with respect to a joint United States-Union of Soviet Socialist Republics guarantee of Middle Eastern frontiers in the interest of world peace; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. KING of New York:

H. Con. Res. 65. Concurrent resolution expressing the sense of the Congress with respect to the settlement of the indebtedness of the French Republic to the United States made by the World War Foreign Debt Commission and approved by the President; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. RODINO:

H. Con. Res. 66. Concurrent resolution to provide for a permanent United Nations Peacekeeping Force; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. ANNUNZIO:

H. Res. 130. Resolution to include drum and bugle corps under the mutual Educational and Cultural Exchange Act of 1961, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. BERRY:

H. Res. 131. Resolution to amend rule XXI of the Rules of the House of Representatives; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. CELLER:

H. Res. 132. Resolution to provide funds for the Committee on the Judiciary; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. QUILLEN:

H. Res. 133. Resolution creating a Select Committee on Standards and Conduct; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. WHITTEN:

H. Res. 134. Resolution creating a select committee to conduct an investigation and study of the Commissioner of Education's policies and guidelines on school desegregation, and to stay action until such study is completed; to the Committee on Rules.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. ANNUNZIO:

H.R. 2433. A bill for the relief of Antonino Ciullo; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ASHMORE:

H.R. 2434. A bill for the relief of Nora Austin Hendrickson; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BLATNIK:

H.R. 2435. A bill for the relief of Masayoshi Arashiba; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BURKE of Massachusetts:

H.R. 2436. A bill to provide for the free entry of certain neckties for the use of the Victorian Club of Boston; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. CAHILL:

H.R. 2437. A bill for the relief of Janina Morawska; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CONABLE:

H.R. 2438. A bill for the relief of Mohammad Maqsood Alam; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. EDWARDS of California:

H.R. 2439. A bill for the relief of S & S Vending Machine Company; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. FARBSTEIN:

H.R. 2440. A bill for the relief of Benjamin Alexander Shafra; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 2441. A bill for the relief of Dr. Hooshang Behrooz; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 2442. A bill for the relief of Lucia

Cruz Pineda; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 2443. A bill for the relief of Semir Herschel Ghamar; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 2444. A bill for the relief of Irena Romkowska Pol; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 2445. A bill for the relief of Ahouva Rubinstein; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 2446. A bill for the relief of Elaine Minerva Hyton; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 2447. A bill for the relief of Charles B. Murray and Maisie M. Murray; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 2448. A bill for the relief of Ljubica and Zorka Stipevic; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 2449. A bill for the relief of Wong Yue Hong; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 2450. A bill for the relief of Chan Che Ming; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HELSTOSKI:

H.R. 2451. A bill for the relief of Pasqualina Silvaroli (Linda) Fiore; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HICKS:

H.R. 2452. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Mary C. Ryan; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HOSMER:

H.R. 2453. A bill for the relief of Fedor Frank Bacskai and his wife, Susanne Kostyal Bacskai; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. KASTENMEIER:

H.R. 2454. A bill for the relief of the children of Mrs. Doris E. Warren; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 2455. A bill for the relief of Dean P. Bartelt; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mrs. KELLY:

H.R. 2456. A bill for the relief of Shaoul Shammah; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 2457. A bill for the relief of Serafino Tomassetti and his wife, Luisa Maria Tomassetti; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 2458. A bill for the relief of Hazel Ann Smith; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 2459. A bill for the relief of Pamalet Maxian Garth; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 2460. A bill for the relief of Frida and Jacobo Goldstein; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 2461. A bill for the relief of Wan Tao Liu; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. KING of California:

H.R. 2462. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Irene Florence Lamey; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. KING of New York:

H.R. 2463. A bill for the relief of Itzhaq Feldman; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 2464. A bill for the relief of Yoo Young Hul; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 2465. A bill for the relief of Dyung-Ki Kim; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 2466. A bill for the relief of Gerasimoida Nisidin; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 2467. A bill for the relief of Lem Buck You, Lem Soo Ying, and Lem Stanley; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. McCORMACK:

H.R. 2468. A bill for the relief of Dr. Morely Maayan; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 2469. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Deborah Gisela Trinezer de Sperber; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 2470. A bill to provide for the free entry of one rheogoniometer for the use of Tufts University, Boston, Mass.; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. MACHEN:

H.R. 2471. A bill for the relief of Dr. Albert Victor Michael Ferris-Prabhu; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MINISH:

H.R. 2472. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Agnes Chin-An Sun and her daughter, Paulina Sun, and her son, John Sun; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. O'HARA of Illinois:

H.R. 2473. A bill for the relief of Efstathia Marinakos; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 2474. A bill for the relief of Ilea Kalember; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 2475. A bill for the relief of Harry Chuen Lee and his wife, Corinne Lee; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 2476. A bill for the relief of Konstantinos Kanas; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. O'NEAL of Georgia:

H.R. 2477. A bill for the relief of John J. McGrath; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. REINECKE:

H.R. 2478. A bill for the relief of Josefina Pilcar Abutani Fullar; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 2479. A bill for the relief of Saydi Issa Ghazal; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 2480. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Hechmat Barkohani Nehorayan; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 2481. A bill for the relief of Alejandro Ham Chea; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 2482. A bill for the relief of Roman Padua; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. REUSS:

H.R. 2483. A bill for the relief of Antonio Garcia Sola; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 2484. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Katharina Doerner; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 2485. A bill for the relief of Elisabeta Horwath; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ROYBAL:

H.R. 2486. A bill for the relief of Seok Yul Han; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 2487. A bill for the relief of Hung Shik Park and his wife, Myoung Hee Park; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SIKES:

H.R. 2488. A bill for the relief of Robert Baldwin Lloyd; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. TEAGUE of California:

H.R. 2489. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Laurette Mae Dunn; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 2490. A bill for the relief of Adolfo Lopez Mendez, doctor of medicine; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 2491. A bill for the relief of Fumihiro Morikawa, Masamitsu Kaneko, and Masakatsu Kawano; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 2492. A bill for the relief of Manuel J. Vicent; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 2493. A bill for the relief of Reyes Cardona-Banuelos; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 2494. A bill for the relief of Hamaka Nakamura; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 2495. A bill for the relief of Rene Paulo Rohden-Sobrinho; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. TEAGUE of Texas:

H.R. 2496. A bill for the relief of Frank Brothers; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. TUNNEY:

H.R. 2497. A bill for the relief of Mario Antonio Ramirez; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 2498. A bill for the relief of Sophia Panagiotis Iosifidou; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 2499. A bill for the relief of Antonio Manuel de Rezende de Sousa Andrade; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WHITTEN:

H.R. 2500. A bill for the relief of Constan-

tine George Xidarls and his wife, Ismini Xidarls; to the Committee on the Judiciary.
By Mr. WINN:

H.R. 2501. A bill for the relief of Dr. Jinks Einstein Walter; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

SENATE

MONDAY, JANUARY 16, 1967

(Legislative day of Thursday, January 12, 1967)

The Senate met at 12 o'clock meridian, on the expiration of the recess, and was called to order by Hon. WILLIAM B. SPONG, JR., a Senator from the State of Virginia.

The Chaplain, Rev. Frederick Brown Harris, D.D., offered the following prayer:

Eternal God, Father of all men, Thou hast taught us that in quietness and in confidence shall be our strength. In the midst of these feverish days we pray Thou wilt breathe through the heats of our desire Thy coolness and Thy balm.

Take from our souls the strain and stress and let our ordered lives confess the beauty of Thy peace. Send us forth as sons of the morning to bring Thy light to every shadowed life we meet. As every ray of sunshine leads back to the sun, so this hour teach our thoughts to travel up the road of Thy benedictions to Thyself.

"For every virtue we possess
And every victory won,
And every thought of holiness,
Are Thine alone."

For Thine is the kingdom and the power. Amen.

DESIGNATION OF ACTING PRESIDENT PRO TEMPORE

The legislative clerk read the following letter:

U.S. SENATE,
PRESIDENT PRO TEMPORE,
Washington, D.C., January 16, 1967.
To the Senate:
Being temporarily absent from the Senate, I appoint Hon. WILLIAM B. SPONG, JR., a Senator from the State of Virginia, to perform the duties of the Chair during my absence.

CARL HAYDEN,
President pro tempore.

Mr. SPONG thereupon took the chair as Acting President pro tempore.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. MANSFIELD, and by unanimous consent, the Journal of the proceedings of Thursday, January 12, 1967, was approved.

ATTENDANCE OF A SENATOR

Hon. WALTER F. MONDALE, a Senator from the State of Minnesota, appeared in his seat today.

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT

Messages in writing from the President of the United States, submitting

nominations, were communicated to the Senate by Mr. Jones, one of his secretaries.

EXECUTIVE MESSAGES REFERRED

As in executive session,
The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate messages from the President of the United States submitting sundry nominations, which were referred to the appropriate committees.

(For nominations this day received, see the end of Senate proceedings.)

AMENDMENT OF STANDING RULES OF THE SENATE

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. McGOVERN] to proceed to the consideration of Senate Resolution 6.

LIMITATION ON STATEMENTS DURING THE TRANSACTION OF ROUTINE MORNING BUSINESS

On request of Mr. MANSFIELD, and by unanimous consent, statements during the transaction of routine morning business were ordered limited to 3 minutes.

ASSIGNMENT OF MINORITY PARTY'S MEMBERSHIP ON STANDING COMMITTEES

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, I send to the desk a resolution setting forth the names of Senators who shall constitute the minority party's membership on the standing committees of the Senate for the 90th Congress, and I ask unanimous consent for its immediate consideration.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection to the present consideration of the resolution?

There being no objection, the resolution (S. Res. 18) was read, considered, and agreed to, as follows:

S. Res. 18

Resolved, that the following shall constitute the minority party's membership on the standing committees of the Senate for the Ninetieth Congress:

COMMITTEE ON AERONAUTICAL AND SPACE SCIENCES

Mrs. Smith, Messrs. Hickenlooper, Curtis, Jordan, Brooke, Percy.

COMMITTEE ON AGRICULTURE AND FORESTRY

Messrs. Alken, Young, Boggs, Miller, Hatfield.

COMMITTEE ON APPROPRIATIONS

Messrs. Young, Mundt, Mrs. Smith, Messrs. Kuchel, Hruska, Allott, Cotton, Case, Javits.

COMMITTEE ON ARMED SERVICES

Mrs. Smith, Messrs. Thurmond, Miller, Tower, Pearson, Dominick.

COMMITTEE ON BANKING AND CURRENCY

Messrs. Bennett, Tower, Hickenlooper, Brooke, Percy.

COMMITTEE ON COMMERCE

Messrs. Cotton, Morton, Scott, Prouty, Pearson, Griffin.

COMMITTEE ON THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

Messrs. Prouty, Dominick, Morton.

COMMITTEE ON FINANCE

Messrs. Williams of Delaware, Carlson, Bennett, Curtis, Morton, Dirksen.

COMMITTEE ON FOREIGN RELATIONS

Messrs. Hickenlooper, Alken, Carlson, Williams of Delaware, Mundt, Case, Cooper.

COMMITTEE ON GOVERNMENT OPERATIONS

Messrs. Mundt, Curtis, Javits, Hansen, Baker.

COMMITTEE ON INTERIOR AND INSULAR AFFAIRS

Messrs. Kuchel, Allott, Jordan of Idaho, Fannin, Hansen, Hatfield.

COMMITTEE ON THE JUDICIARY

Messrs. Dirksen, Hruska, Fong, Scott, Thurmond.

COMMITTEE ON LABOR AND PUBLIC WELFARE

Messrs. Javits, Prouty, Dominick, Murphy, Fannin, Griffin.

COMMITTEE ON POST OFFICE AND CIVIL SERVICE

Messrs. Carlson, Fong, Boggs, Fannin.

COMMITTEE ON PUBLIC WORKS

Messrs. Cooper, Fong, Boggs, Murphy, Jordan of Idaho, Baker.

COMMITTEE ON RULES AND ADMINISTRATION

Messrs. Curtis, Cooper, Scott.

SENATOR SMATHERS ELECTED CHAIRMAN OF THE SELECT COMMITTEE ON SMALL BUSINESS

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I send to the desk a resolution and ask unanimous consent for its immediate consideration.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection to the present consideration of the resolution?

Without objection, the resolution (S. Res. 19) was read, considered, and agreed to, as follows:

Resolved, That Mr. Smathers, of Florida be, and he is hereby, elected chairman of the Select Committee on Small Business, in lieu of Mr. Sparkman, of Alabama, resigned.

STATEMENT OF THE MAJORITY LEADER AT THE DEMOCRATIC CONFERENCE

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, on January 10, just prior to the convening of the new session, the Senate Democratic conference held its first meeting of the year. At that meeting I made some brief remarks on Vietnam and other problems confronting the 90th Congress. I also indicated my thoughts on the course of action the Senate, and, in particular, its Democratic Members, should endeavor to pursue in the new Congress in order to meet the responsibilities which devolve upon us to make a contribution to the leadership of the Nation. I ask unanimous consent, Mr. President, that the text of my statement to the Democratic conference be printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT OF THE MAJORITY LEADER AT THE DEMOCRATIC CONFERENCE, JANUARY 10, 1967

There is no point in blinking at the fact that we enter upon the 1st session of the 90th Congress at a time of deep national concern. It is a concern which traces to Viet Nam, and it will not lighten very soon or very easily. The preoccupation will continue because the